THEOLOGY

VOL. L MAY, 1947 No. 323

Editorial

THIS is the jubilee year of the Bush Brotherhoods in Australia, and the article which follows is, we believe, the first comprehensive account that has been written of their origin, their growth, and their achievements. It is a story that, in addition to its intrinsic interest, may contain much instruction for the Church in England and elsewhere. But it is not instruction of the copy-book kind. The mistake is sometimes made of supposing that because a method has worked in Australia or Central Africa or even in the South Sea Islands it would work in England. Likewise, there are people who persist in saying that England is now a pagan or heathen country and that the Church at home must model itself on the Church in the mission field. But this is to play about with words. A country which has been Christian for centuries does not, if it ceases to be Christian, return to its previous state. The task of the Church in a pre-Christian and in a post-Christian society is bound to be very different. A great deal is known about the former, and very little as yet about the latter. To use the words "pagan" and "mission field" to cover both cases merely obscures the difference and prevents people from realizing that the Church in England to-day, as in other European countries, is confronted with a task that is unprecedented.

The article which we recently published on the Church in France brought this fact out very clearly. The new relation between the Church and society seems to be better understood there than here, probably because the old order has more obviously gone beyond recall. More enterprise is also being shown in discovering new methods of approach to the unchurched masses. We hope shortly to publish more information about these experiments in France. However, it would be a further mistake to suppose that the English Church can simply copy the French Church.

We have got to find our own way to new methods and to learn by experiment and by making mistakes. It is evident that the parochial system as it has been traditionally worked is already breaking down and, so far as can be seen, must continue to do so with increasing rapidity. No sensible churchman will regard this as a matter for satisfaction, but it is just a waste of time to expatiate upon the advantages of having a full-time parson resident in every parish. No one can yet say how the parochial system can best be adapted or transformed to meet the new conditions. It is very likely that no general prescription will meet the case. Urban and rural areas present quite different problems anyhow, and methods that will work in one part of the country may not work in another, and so on.

In these circumstances, the way needs to be made open for local

enterprise and a wide variety of experiment. At present the way is blocked by a great many legal and administrative obstacles. The leaders of the Church will be doing a good service if they can take steps to remove these obstacles. It is unreasonable to expect them to produce an over-all plan, and if what we have said about the necessity for experiment is true that is not what is needed.

But supposing conditions existed in which there was much more freedom to experiment, have we men with the imagination and courage to strike out in new directions and to risk making big mistakes? It is at this point that the story of the Bush Brotherhoods may have instruction for us. There too was a situation in which the parochial system would not work, and there was a remarkable number of men who were eager to break new ground and were prepared for any amount of hardship in doing so. There seems to have been a minimum of organization and a blessed absence of committees. If the Church of England is not producing such men now, may it not be because the elaboration of efficient organization has had the effect of hampering initiative, sapping the sense of personal responsibility, subduing bold leadership? Efficiency organized through more or less anonymous committees and in great offices appears to nurture men who are safe, prudent, cautious, and amiable. These are the virtues that come to be most prized and promoted. But they happen not to be the virtues on which the Church of England stands in most need at the present time.

We believe that many of the men who are coming forward for ordination from the Forces are prepared for new experiments, would welcome them in fact, and are not expecting to have a soft time. They are taking their training very seriously. They have no desire to be amateurs at their job. Is the ecclesiastical system flexible enough to provide scope for fresh enterprises, analogous to the Bush Brotherhoods in Australia? Are there men with wisdom and experience like Bishop Westcott and Bishop Dawes to guide, encourage, and lead such enterprises?

NOTE

The delay in the appearance of this number of THEOLOGY is due to the fact that the final proofs disappeared in the post on their way back to the printer. We regret that for the same reason some of the corrections made by contributors have been lost.

The Birth of the Bush Brotherhood

At Oxford House in 1896 there was a luncheon party which is of significance for history. Arthur Foley Winnington-Ingram was there, and on his right, as guest of honour, Nathaniel Dawes, first Bishop of Rockhampton. The Bishop was very interested in Oxford House. For some while past it had been in his mind as pointing towards the solution of a problem which faced him in his diocese "four times as big as England and Wales," as to how to bring the ministrations of the Church to a population spread so thinly over a vast area. He had even then but a dozen clergy. The Church had tried to reproduce in Australia the parochial system, but the recent expansion of the pastoral industry, and of mining, by spreading a thin covering of humanity over the country, showed the weakness of this. Dawes himself in later years said, "It was clear that the old parochial system was not only inadequate but totally unsuitable for coping with the difficulties which prevail in Bush districts."[1]

He was not the man to be daunted. In his way he was as remarkable a man as his host that day. Before going to Oxford he had been apprenticed to the South-Eastern Railway works at Ashford. A career as inspector of machinery closed with three and a half years spent in supervising the building of Blackfriars Bridge as it was made, arch by arch, at Wednesbury and carted to London. A man who could break with such a career because of the compelling call to the ministry would, under the compulsion of circumstances in his diocese, be willing to break with old ways, even the parochial system.

It was after fifteen years of ministry in London that Dawes was persuaded, rather against his will, to undertake the charge of a parish in Brisbane. Three years later, in 1889, he was consecrated Bishop Coadjutor to the Bishop of Brisbane. In 1892, when the new diocese of Rockhampton was formed for Central Queensland, he was unanimously elected to be its first bishop. It was a fearful task which faced him. The new diocese was formed from the less settled part of Queensland and was cut off from the centre of wealth and population in Brisbane. The clergy were a mere handful—the diocese "the size of the German Empire." Only one parish could support its own priest. Nothing daunted, the Bishop appointed travelling clergy with the help of a grant from S.P.G.[2] But he was not satisfied with this. "I determined to adopt," he said later, "the principle of associated work such as had proved helpful elsewhere, as for example the Oxford Mission to Calcutta and the Oxford House in Bethnal Green, but modified to meet the conditions of Bush life in Australia."[3]

Calcutta and Bethnal Green seem very far apart, but the work done in both in the name of Oxford owes its inspiration to a Cambridge man, Brooke Foss Westcott. He was more than a scholar, however great. He was a prophet and man of affairs. One of his constant

[1] *Recollections of 21 Years*—lectures delivered at Worcester, November, 1909, by Bishop Dawes. (Private MSS.)

[2] Pascoe, *200 Years of S.P.G.*, p. 414c.

[3] *Recollections of 21 Years.*

enthusiasms was for Missions to India—another the Christian Social Union, the alternative to the more fiery Guild of St Matthew. These enthusiasms, mated to his conviction that effective missionary work must be done by a "Brotherhood," gave birth, the former to the Cambridge Mission to Delhi (1877), the latter in the 'eighties to the University Settlements in the slums. The Oxford Mission to Calcutta, formed in 1879, obviously owes much to Westcott, as indeed does the Dublin Mission to Chota Nagpur (1890).

Indeed, associated work (community missions) was no innovation in 1896. The work of Edward Bickersteth at Delhi in 1877 had borne much fruit. There were several brotherhoods which, whilst living a common life, undertook corporate responsibility for a piece of work, and which priests joined for a certain number of years as a minimum. Bishop Dawes felt that here was a way of overcoming the isolation of the Bush priest and of drawing men to the work. His problem was how to combine the brotherhood method of work with the necessity of men living apart in order to minister in the vastness of the Bush. The solution he came to was that the men must come together at regular intervals to live a common life. In other ways the brotherhood method was to be used. There was to be corporate responsibility for the work and a rule of life. This combination was Bishop Dawes' original contribution—and it transformed the Brotherhood Mission into something new.

With this in his mind, he came to England in good time for the Lambeth Conference of 1897, that he might further the scheme. So it was he found himself at Oxford House this day in 1896 telling the company of the difficulties of the Church in Central Queensland and speaking of what suggested itself to him. Winnington-Ingram was impressed. He felt the scheme was possible, and advised the Bishop to consult, inevitably, Westcott at Durham and his Diocesan Missioner, Canon Body. So were the chief persons drawn together.

Dawes went, as advised, to Durham. He went seeking counsel and a leader for his experiment. Westcott was possessed not only of wisdom and influence but of a precious store of potential Bush priests. It was not long before this that some thirty of the younger clergy of his diocese had written to him about service overseas. "We would ask whether in any way men can be encouraged to intimate either unitedly or individually, but privately, to their bishop that they wish to be at his free disposal, if occasion shall arise, for home or foreign service. We note that it is not expected of the private soldier in an earthly army to select his own post and own manœuvres. We do not think it should always be left to private soldiers in the Divine army of aggression to do so. We think that those who stand on the Church's watch towers may be willing to organize and direct us if they are at once convinced that we are willing to obey orders and thankful to have them to obey." Westcott replied that he dared not decline such a charge.[1] Of the two leaders of those young clergy, one was George Dowglass Halford, Vicar of St Peter's, Jarrow.

[1] C. H. S. Matthews, *A Parson in the Australian Bush* (London, 1910), pp. 32-3.

Before the interview Dawes saw Canon Body. "You have a hard nut to crack," he was told; "the bishop won't let Halford go unless he is convinced that the proposal is thoroughly sound." Cracking the nut took two hours, during which Westcott questioned keenly as to the proposed details of the scheme. He began by saying, "If you are not able to guarantee effective and continuous companionship to the priests who are sent to minister in the Bush I will not give you a single man. But if you guarantee that there will be genuine companionship for them I will send my best." It was with relief that Dawes at length heard this apostle of "Associated Missions" say, "I quite approve your plans. I shall advise Mr Halford to go."[1] Despite an almost universal protest from the people of his parish, Halford took that advice. It was the call of authority for which he looked.

A public meeting was held in the Grosvenor Hall "to advocate the claims of a missionary settlement in the Bush District of Central Queensland." Westcott could not be there, but wrote of the experiment as "a new and most necessary departure in our colonial work . . . the occasion demands the best we can give." Canon Body spoke of the work as purely tentative, a venture of faith, and added, "If the effort succeeds it must be repeated and reproduced throughout the length and breadth of the Colonial Church." Gore, too, spoke. He said that a condition of success was that "the Brothers must expend a good deal of trouble on each other."[2] Another speaker was Winnington-Ingram, who became treasurer to the auxiliary then formed, carrying on even during his four years as Bishop of Stepney. Of course Bishop Dawes himself spoke. Half-humorously he called the venture a "Bush Brotherhood."[3] It was a stroke of genius. The name stuck: it was so obviously right.

In 1897 Halford arrived in Queensland and took up his work. So was born "the Father of all Bush Brotherhoods," the Brotherhood of St Andrew, Longreach. Dawes himself described the beginning. "Happy under the loving personality of George Halford, the internal economy of the Brotherhood was from the first stamped and cemented by mutual affection. The Brothers work like apostles and are as happy and frolicsome as sandboys. They very soon won the respect and esteem of all classes."[4] So were fulfilled the conditions of success envisaged by Gore.

The circumstances under which the Longreach Brotherhood worked were by no means confined to Central Queensland. They are found in most of the dioceses in Australia. Immediately to the south of the Longreach district, in the Brisbane diocese, there were but three priests working in the west, and often not even three. Bishop Webber, about 1896, appointed Arthur Richard Rivers as Archdeacon with a "roving commission" and no instructions beyond that of filling in gaps. (Dawes had been driven to a similar expediency of travelling clergy two years before.) It proved to be the first step towards the second

[1] Bishop Dawes at meeting of Rockhampton Auxiliary, October 30, 1908.
[2] *Ibid.* [3] Dawes, *Recollections of 21 Years* (1909).
[4] Dawes at Rockhampton Auxiliary meeting, 1908.

Bush Brotherhood. Rivers chose himself a centre, Tiaro on the railway, and soon the "gaps" appeared. Work flooded in upon him. Gayndah parish, about 150 miles north of Brisbane, and in the comparatively settled coastal belt, fell vacant; flying visits had to be made to it. No one was going to other townships far away in the west, one hundred, two hundred miles and more from Gayndah-Taroom, Burnett, Surat, St George. Then the aboriginal mission was vacant. Fortunately help came in the shape of some laymen. Bishop Webber in England promised the first volunteer for his diocese for the work. In 1901 two priests joined Rivers—one was a curate in the diocese, the other the promised volunteer from England, Herbert Lavallin Puxley. They aimed at giving services in the towns on six Sundays in a quarter, and quarterly visits to all accessible stations, in districts which before had at the best but one visit in the year. So was the Brotherhood born at Gayndah in 1901. It was a sturdy child of some three and a half happy, busy years when it moved to Charleville. Archbishop Donaldson arrived in Brisbane in 1904, and saw that conditions demanded a change. The large stations round Gayndah had been broken up, and the closer settlement could support a parish. One of the Brothers was left behind in charge of it. Settlers had moved out farther west and cried out for the attention of the Church. So Donaldson bade the Brotherhood move to Charleville, three hundred and fifty miles west of Gayndah. Puxley, saying, "I came out here to do as I was told," was made head. A great deal of the district worked from Gayndah was retained, and an anonymous gift which brought in £200 yearly, for "a Brotherhood in the West," helped on the work in this pioneer stage. This Charleville Brotherhood, born at Gayndah in 1901, was no mere copy, even though it owed the name and much else to Longreach. For it sprang from Archdeacon Rivers' roving commission.[1]

Body had said that the work if successful must spread throughout the Colonial Church. To an extent it has done so, more especially in Australia. The Gayndah Brotherhood of 1901 was but the beginning of that spreading. Halford had not even arrived in Australia when the news of the proposed Brotherhood fired with enthusiasm a young New College graduate, then on the staff of Lord Hampden, Governor of New South Wales. This was Frederick Henry Campion. Having travelled in the Bush, he knew something of the difficulties facing the Church there. A Bush Brotherhood seemed so fitted to meet the situation that he determined to return to England and, after ordination and parish experience, return to New South Wales, there to form a Brotherhood.

At Wells, Campion met a young Cambridge man, Charles Henry Selfe Matthews, and enthused him with the idea of working in the Australian Bush and of a Brotherhood. Not until 1901 did the plan mature. In that year Edward Howard Lea, a young "Augustinian" to whom Campion had confided his idea at first, was made rector of the huge "parish" of Dubbo in the diocese of Bathurst. Immediately

[1] *Charleville Bush Brotherhood Notes*, Vol. XXIII, No. 14, September, 1926.

e wrote to Campion asking him to go as his assistant curate and to ring with him another priest, expressing the hope that this might be ne first step towards forming a Bush Brotherhood. The new assistant urate of Dubbo sailed from Liverpool in November, 1901, together ith Matthews as "Assistant Missioner" and Reuben Coverdale, a ay brother of the Wolverhampton Evangelist Brotherhood. Early in 902 work began in Dubbo.

For eighteen months they worked in the parish, gaining experience. radually plans grew. Bishop Camidge was full of sympathy and ncouragement, and in 1903 presented a block of land next to the hurch for the Brotherhood. In August of that year the Governor of ew South Wales laid the foundation stone of the Brotherhood House uilt upon it. Campion became Principal, and Matthews Vice-rincipal, of the Brotherhood of the Good Shepherd. So was born the hird Bush Brotherhood. Its birth was announced in some of the ydney papers in an unusual way. "Anglican monks for Bush Parishes. What next? And next?" On the whole, however, people both in ydney and elsewhere were helpful and sympathetic.[1] The company ad to register itself as a company with a board of directors, partly in rder to protect itself. Its description in the memorandum of associa-ion reads strangely. "To found an association of a number of clergy-nen of the Church of England who shall reside together in a home or omes to be provided by the company, and who from time to time shall ravel through the outlying districts of the said State to visit and minister to all persons residing there, and to maintain the said home." o wonder the Attorney-General and the Solicitor-General of New outh Wales were somewhat incredulous when Campion approached hem! This registration tied the Brotherhood to Dubbo as its head-uarters.

While these developments took place at Gayndah and at Dubbo, the ower of Longreach was making itself felt in the diocese of North Queensland. In 1902 Aneurin Vaughan Williams became incumbent f the large district of Herberton, the fourteenth in fifteen years. With so many changes constructive work, especially in the outlying ownships, was impossible. In his own words, "The Longreach rotherhood was evidently the best way of ministering a wide Bush District." Bishop Barlow was scheming a settlement at Cairns on omewhat different lines when later in that same year (1902) he was uccеeded by George Horsfall Frodsham. Now Vaughan Williams ad his desire. The new bishop was faced with an acute "man power" risis. The parochial system in the "back blocks" was not working,[2] witness the changes at Herberton. He welcomed the idea of a Bush rotherhood. The priest in charge of the neighbouring district to Herberton was J. B. Barton. His headquarters were at Mareeba (with either church nor parsonage), some thirty miles from Cairns on the oast, but his district extended 150 miles west to the River Etheridge. He agreed to join in forming a Brotherhood. The two-roomed rectory

[1] C. H. S. Matthews, *A Parson in the Australian Bush*, pp. 71-7.
[2] *N. Queensland Jubilee Book*, p. 14.

at Herberton was enlarged (by Barton's skill in joinery and according to Vaughan Williams' plan) into the Community House. In 1903, at a service held in Bishop's Lodge, Townsville, Vaughan Williams was admitted first head of the Community of St Barnabas (the name was chosen by them from old associations). A lay brother joined the two priests and together they worked the vast district systematically, making the rule never to break an engagement, even though it meant swimming swollen rivers and other excitements! The work soon established itself and in a few years five churches were built.[1]

It was Bishop Frodsham who drew up the constitution of the Community. The name "Community" is significant. It marks a stress on "community life" which is a development of the original Bush Brotherhood idea. That was rather a sort of "Bush Clergy House" and involved no vows. Here, however, the Brothers took the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, though for a limited period only, a feature which Frodsham had to defend against those who maintained that vows are by their nature life-long.[2]

Armed with this constitution and burning with the urgent needs of his diocese, Frodsham came to England in 1908, ostensibly for the Lambeth Conference. He joined the crowd of hungry, priest-seeking bishops. He had a powerful ally in Winnington-Ingram, Bishop of London, always a good friend of Bush Brotherhoods, and who in all sent over fifty priests out to join them. Indeed, in the year before this, he had sent out John Oliver Feetham, from a ten-year curacy in Bethnal Green, to Dubbo, and so gave the Church in Australia the present Bishop of Queensland, of whom it has been said that "no one living has done more for Bush Brotherhoods." In October, 1908, Frodsham was given his chance. Ten minutes of the time allowed to the Bishop of London for a lecture at Oxford was given up to him. "O for a band of men that will preach like Apostles, ride like cowboys, and having food and raiment will therewith be content," he pleaded. The next morning ten undergraduates offered themselves to him, when they should have been ordained and served their title curacies. Similar success met him at Cambridge. In Dublin he won the Rector of St George's, Edward Travers Crozier, who with another priest was the first addition to the Brotherhood. The two newcomers undertook the charge of the 80,000 square miles of the Cloncurry district, with its mining townships and cattle stations, which was added to the Community's charge.[3] When in 1910 Vaughan Williams left Queensland, Crozier was made head. Soon the flow of recruits began to arrive and the Community (now the Brotherhood) of St Barnabas came to maturity.

The urgent necessities of Bush districts have since called other Brotherhoods into being. As early as 1897 conditions on the Coolgardie goldfields gave birth to the idea of one there in Western Aus-

[1] MS, A. Vaughan Williams.
[2] G. H. Frodsham, "Bush Brotherhoods and Community Life" (*East and West Review*, Vol. XI, April, 1913).
[3] *N. Queensland Jubilee Book*, pp. 15 and 97.

ralia. The idea was stillborn.[1] More lively was the project for a Bush Brotherhood to work among the "Group Settlements" in the Bunbury diocese. This Brotherhood came into being, with two or three priest brothers, and a house, in 1926.[2] Almost exactly midway in time between these, in 1911, the Brotherhood of St Boniface was born, fathered by Bishop Goldsmith of Bunbury. In the first decade of the century immigrants were pouring into Western Australia almost as fast as into Canada. To deal with the situation created in his diocese, Bishop Goldsmith planned a Bush Brotherhood, but men and money were both scarce. The needs of Bunbury were overshadowed by those of Western Canada. His hope for a grant from the Pan-Anglican offering of 1908 was disappointed. At length, on July 11, 1911, two priests and two laymen were admitted members of the Brotherhood of St Boniface, with Brother Arthur Doran Webb as Warden. A farmhouse, "Barroworn," nearly three miles out of the little town of Williams, was the Brotherhood house. It was not until after two more experiences of hired headquarters that, through the generosity of an English lady, the "House of Grace" was built at Williams, a town more or less conveniently placed for working the large district entrusted to the Brotherhood.

Organization was not imposed but rather allowed to grow. At first there was no vow of service. Within two years only one original Brother remained. Soon, therefore, a promise of three years' service at least was asked of each Brother on his admittance. Nor was it until 1913 that the Quarterly Union was made a permanent part of the scheme.[3] But the Brotherhood which grew in this way had a fruitful life, maybe because it regarded itself especially as a Brotherhood of prayer. Its decease was due to a most satisfactory cause—success. In 1929, soon after John Frewer was called from its head to be Bishop of North-West Australia, it was felt by some that the district no longer demanded the Brotherhood method of work. It had become more closely settled and, by the work of the Brotherhood, had been built up into districts capable of supporting resident priests. So the Brotherhood of St Boniface died an honourable death in its eighteenth year.

In South Australia from 1915 until 1921 the Brotherhood of St Aidan worked in the eastern part of the Adelaide diocese. In Willochra diocese the Brotherhood of St Stephen worked from 1927 until the demands of war caused it to lapse through lack of volunteers. In a sense this was a kind of "grandchild" of Bishop Dawes, for its founder, Bishop Richard Thomas, was himself at one time a member of the Brotherhood of St Barnabas, North Queensland.

Another such grandchild has been born recently, when Bishop Robin of Adelaide, another ex-Bush Brother Bishop, soon after going to his diocese in 1944 formed the Brotherhood of St John the Baptist.[4] In New South Wales Dubbo remains the only Brotherhood, for one, dedicated to Our Saviour, and founded by Bishop Druitt (1914-21)

[1] Pascoe, *200 Years of the S.P.G.*, p. 428.
[2] T. S. Groser, *Lure of the Golden West* (London, 1927), p. 33.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 110. [4] *Church Standard*, July, 1944.

in his diocese of Grafton, even though refounded on more definite Brotherhood lines by his successor Bishop Ashton in 1921, has failed to survive. The same fate overtook a Community which worked at Broken Hill in 1915. Another bishop, facing perhaps the hardest problem of any in Australia, in his vast tropical diocese of Carpentaria, is even now hoping and praying that it may be possible to work it through a Bush Brotherhood.[1]

Only Omniscience can say what success Bush Brotherhoods have had in these last fifty years. But straws may show which way the wind blows, and odd facts do stand out as significant. Obviously the way of working has established itself as a good, and possibly necessary, method in wide and sparsely inhabited districts. When in 1944 Bishop Robin proposed to found a Brotherhood in what he calls his "pocket handkerchief" of a diocese, the senior clergy were unanimous in their approval.[2] Writers on the work of the Church in the Bush praise the work that has been done. John Oliver Feetham, the "Bush Brother" Bishop of North Queensland, once said that "For those who know history it is very certain that the Brotherhoods have got the Church of Australia out of some bad holes in the past forty years. The effect of the work of the Bush Brothers on the Church as a whole is far deeper than most people imagine."[3] To this must be added the testimony of a gentleman who, when he clattered up to the Brotherhood House at Cloncurry, seeking to be married, and asked if he belonged to the Church of England, replied, "Church of England be blowed; the Bush Brotherhood's the only church that's ever done me any good. It's them I want."[4]

Pastoral work is the main object of the Brotherhoods. By their success in it they must be judged. In this they have experimented. Dubbo ran a "Wayfarers' Guild" for those who hump the bluey. This fell through, however. At Charleville, a hostel for children from outlying parts who were attending the State school was started in 1919 on the suggestion of S. H. Davies (later Bishop of Carpentaria).[5] So successful was it that similar work was later begun by the Bush Church Aid Society. The Brotherhood of St Barnabas runs a boys' boarding school, All Souls, at Charters Towers, and through it does a mighty work. More important than the Rhodes Scholarships it has won are the Christian men it has produced. This school was founded in 1920 as a war memorial by Reginald Halse, now Archbishop of Brisbane, but then Warden of the Brotherhood.[6] So in many ways are the people tended. Archbishop Sharp of Brisbane judged the Brotherhoods to be a pastoral success in that the Brothers were everywhere welcomed, money was forthcoming, and—most striking of all—the Holy Communion had to be celebrated practically daily on the Bush Brothers' rounds.[7]

Secondary results are, however, by no means unimportant. Many

[1] *The English Carpentarian*, No. 8 (1946). [2] *Church Standard*, July, 1944.
[3] Feetham, *Origin of Bush Brotherhoods* (MS, July, 1940).
[4] *N. Queensland Jubilee Book*, p. 77.
[5] *Charleville Bush Brotherhood Notes*, Vol. XXIII, No. 14, September, 1926.
[6] *N. Queensland Jubilee Book*, p. 90. [7] *Charleville Notes, ibid.*

ple priests have been drawn to Australia to serve in the Brotherhoods nd their abilities strengthened by the experience. Many an English arish has cause to be thankful for qualities shown in their priests who ere Bush Brothers. Incidentally, the bonds holding together the ustralian and the English provinces have been strengthened—a atter of great importance. Many of these men stay to work in ustralia, and the judgment of that Church as to their quality and ffectiveness is contained in the elections which have raised ten Bush rothers to the Episcopate.

More important even than this is the fact that Bush Brotherhoods ve been the means of waking vocations in Australians. Some rotherhoods indeed are completely staffed by them. Dubbo has eated a fund for training young Australians for the ministry. They gn on for eight years, three at college, five in the Brotherhood. In is way the Church in Australia grows to maturity.

Any one of these matters would be of great benefit to the Church; mulatively they mean a great deal. The experiment has been most uitful for good. May this not be because it was no mere experiment r novelty's sake, or putting into practice a theory, but an answer, rayerfully conceived, to a problem God poised before His Church? hen faced with a continent with dioceses, in most cases, as large as he British Isles, and "parishes" proportionately huge, what could the hurch do but reach out after a new way of working? Scarceness of en and of money made this an urgent necessity, although here it must e stressed that Brotherhoods have not proved to be a cheaper way of astoral work. It is efficiency rather than cheapness that constitutes heir merit. From the human side the Brotherhood method, especially t first, looked like a stopgap; but may it not be that God was through hese circumstances beckoning His Church on to something more han patching? This may be a way of working which will have to be xtended and adapted to meet the new conditions which will face the hurch in many lands besides Australia. One who was a Bush rother, and is now a Metropolitan Archbishop, wrote in 1924[1] what an surely still stand:

"It is quite clear to those who have worked any length of time as rothers that the method is capable of extension to many other istricts in Australia. As it is, there are large districts in all states where he system has been tested. And if at times it has partially failed the eason has been largely, if not wholly, due to lack of recruits. There ay be reasons for this shortage, but the chief is probably the fact that he life demands, for a period of years, freedom from family ties, ominal remuneration, subordination of individual ideals to the haring of a common work in willed obedience to the general judgment f a Brotherhood Chapter. . . . Probably more remarkable than any evelopment is the fact that only a Church in communion with Canter- ury could have produced the system. We share with other com- nunions the normal parochial system and the aspirations to the

[1] R. C Halse, *Church Standard*, January, 1924. Quoted in the *North Queensland Jubilee Book*, p. 99.

religious life, but apparently it has been left to the British stock to evolve a system which combines authority and freedom, community of interest and individual initiative in such a way as to be the despair of the logician; but when all is said and done, those who have taken part in the enterprise know its value to themselves and to the task committed to them. They ask no justification, offer no apology, for Shakespeare has summed it long ago in the words of King Harry: WE FEW, WE HAPPY FEW, WE BAND OF BROTHERS."

GEOFFREY BERWICK.

The Use of the Psalms To-day—I

THE compilers of the Revised Prayer Book of 1927 startled the old-fashioned by proposing what was described as the "mutilation of the Psalter." Facing the problems which the continued use of the entire Psalter in public worship presented to their generation, they offered as a solution the excision of one whole Psalm and the omission of verses from half a dozen others. There are real problems to be solved, but this particular solution is either over-bold in attempting to arbitrate between the relative value of different verses of Scripture, or too timid in refusing to carry the principle very much farther. As Dr Darwell Stone at the time remarked, "To mention only three out of many instances, and to choose three of different kinds, there is as much difficulty about the passages 'I was shapen in wickedness, and in sin hath my mother conceived me,' 'Be not merciful unto them that offend of malicious wickedness,' 'Moab is my wash-pot; over Edom will I cast out my shoe,' apart from the mystical interpretation, as there is in some of those which are bracketed" (F. L. Cross, *Darwell Stone*, p. 48). The phrase "*apart from the mystical interpretation*" gives his own solution, and in the S.P.C.K. *Commentary on Holy Scripture*, published in 1928, he expresses his own judgment that "the Church is not likely to retain the reading of the O.T. and the recitation of the psalter in public worship unless the use of mystical interpretation is to some extent recognized" (p. 695). Theologians have been slow, though this was written almost twenty years ago, to follow up his clue, especially in regard to the Psalter. The Rev. G. D. Carleton in his *English Psalter*, published in 1945, has given us some valuable hints and suggestions. But the subject still sorely needs a more extended treatment, and in particular a more precise statement of the "extent" (so uncertainly defined by Dr Stone) to which the mystical interpretation can be justified.

For the matter is by no means a purely academic one. It faces the parish priest week by week, if not day by day. If the public use of the Psalter is not to "revolve endlessly round the little treadmill of the Vicar's fifteen favourite Psalms" we need some *apologia* both to ourselves and our people for the continued use of the Psalms in public worship, and if we are to find such an *apologia* it must be based on some understanding of theological principles. Indeed, I believe this question of the right interpretation of the Psalms to be a key point in

ur grasp of the interpretation of the Old Testament as a whole. And ntil we of the clergy ourselves have some right understanding of that e cannot hope that it will get across—explicitly or implicitly—to the yfolk of the Church. It is on these grounds that one who is no expert ntures to raise again some of the issues.

Our difficulties—the difficulties, I mean, of the devout Christian orshipper, clerical or lay—are due to the growth of the historical or nigher" criticism of the last two or three generations. We cannot go hind that, as if it had never been, and its guidance towards a truer derstanding of the origin and growth and nature of the Holy riptures has been of inestimable value. But it has been in the main dissolvent influence; it has stressed origins and history and literal anings; and we have now to ask ourselves where we stand devo- nally, liturgically, spiritually in our use of the Scriptures and pecially of the Old Testament.

The Psalms, in particular, are, as I said, a key point; a key point, cause they are a part not of "material for worship" like the Lessons, t an actual expression of worship, a form of public or private prayer. ow whereas it is possible to listen to the reading of the Old and New estament Lessons in a detached, historical spirit, we cannot *pray* such an attitude. We can listen, for instance, to the story of David nd Bathsheba and of Nathan's parable as a story of the past with a oral of some sort for ourselves to *reflect on*, but we cannot take Psalm li n our lips merely as an historical memory of David's penitence. If it not more than that, we had better scrap its use entirely, and some hristian clergy (and probably more Christian laity) would recommend at solution. If we are not to make so drastic a break with Christian nd Jewish) tradition, how are we to provide a living interpretation the Psalter?

Let us recognize, first and at once, that there are several modes of terpretation of the Psalter. Some of these may be legitimate, others ss so—and we shall have to consider later whether there is a clear ividing line between them.

(1) Every Psalm will have had, to begin with, a specific origin, and n original meaning—and we shall go to Kirkpatrick or Barnes or one the scholarly commentators to guide us to what that may have been. ccasionally they may be able to trace the origin for us with some egree of certainty, though we have to remember that the Psalter is self a composite work—a hymn book—and that, as in our own ymn books, modifications may have been deliberately made to render poem more suitable for corporate worship. But if we can assign salm li to its origin (if that be David's sin and penitence in the atter of Bathsheba), or Psalm xlv to the wedding of Solomon or hab or Hezekiah, are we much farther forward? It is not for its teral meaning—*i.e.* its meaning in the circumstances of its origin—that e used it at Mattins or Evensong yesterday or last Sunday; any more an our congregation next week will use the hymn "Abide with me" s expressing the feelings of the curate of Brixham about to leave his arish and seek health or find death in a foreign land, or Newman's Lead, kindly light" to express the bewilderment and doubt of soul

which led him eventually to find refuge in another communion. This may sound pedantic, but it establishes the point (which is sometimes overlooked) that the literal or historical meaning of a hymn, a psalm, a collect, a prayer, is irrelevant, and that *some* kind of application or "interpretation" is inevitably, even unconsciously, made.

(2) If we may continue our example of Psalm li, the most *obvious* immediate application of it will be, I suppose, an *individual* one. "Have mercy upon me, O God, after Thy great goodness: according to the multitude of Thy mercies do away mine offences. Wash me throughly from my wickedness: and cleanse me from my sin. For I acknowledge my faults: and my sin is ever before me." That fits well many an occasion in the life of the individual Christian, and perhaps of all the Psalms there is none that so well serves (a particular mood of) individual devotion. I add those words in parenthesis because that explanation will scarcely account for its use in the liturgy of Ash Wednesday, nor can we assume that every member of a Christian congregation will necessarily feel it acutely on the tenth morning of the month at the hour of Morning Prayer. No doubt the 51st Psalm is peculiarly personal because its origin was obviously a profoundly personal experience (except perhaps its two concluding verses, which are said to be too liturgical, corporate, and sacrificial to be "original"!). That personal origin is true of many, *though not of all*, the Psalms. Several, at least of the later ones, were no doubt composed for corporate worship. The historical Psalms can never have been personal utterances. But there are many that can be, and have been, in constant personal use in private prayer from the day of their inclusion in the Psalter until now. *But even they* cannot be used without some transposition or "adaptation." Even the 23rd will need allegorization of "rod and staff," and the 91st (the Compline Psalm) of "lions and adders." In any case, this individual use of the Psalter does not explain its employment as a vehicle of corporate worship.

(3) The *corporate* interpretation to which we have just alluded goes back, we are told, to Jewish times. Even the 139th Psalm ("O Lord, thou hast searched me out and known me . . . ") is said to have been interpreted by the Jews not of the individual and physical body ("I am fearfully and wonderfully made . . . my bones are not hid from Thee, though I be made secretly and fashioned beneath in the earth . . . ") but of the nation. (I have, however, never traced the reference behind its mention in Bishop Walpole's *People's Psalter*.) The historical Psalms certainly, the liturgical Psalms of praise like the 136th and the closing Psalms no less certainly, must from the start have been corporate utterances, and the Christian use of the Psalter appears from the earliest Christian days to have been primarily corporate and only secondarily individual. There is indeed something rather startling in the immediate and unquestioned and universal taking over by the new Israel of the worship book of the old Israel—if in fact it be not truer to say that the Christian Church has used the Psalter as a vehicle of corporate worship even more continuously and consistently than the Jewish. In any case the traditional—and until recently universal—interpretation of the Psalter by the *Christian* Church has been a corpor-

te one, finding in the "I" of the Psalter not the individual "me" of a ngle member but the corporate voice of God's people, the new people f the new covenant now, lineal heir to the old people of the old ovenant. And that corporate voice of God's people expresses on earth he voice of the Eternal Christ whose earthly mystical Body she is. his is surely the clue to the use of the Psalter in our age as in every hristian one. It is the Church whose utterances the Psalms (like the ollects) gather up, whose experiences of joy and sorrow, of thanks- iving and penitence, of persecution and contempt and deliverance and iumph they express. But the Church's experiences are, deeper still, he experiences of Christ: not only of the human Jesus who used them n His incarnate life in Palestine, whose sufferings He found expressed n the 22nd, 31st, and 69th Psalms; but of THE CHRIST, the Anointed of od, "Fulfiller of the Past," the Eternal "Risen, Ascended, Glorified" on of God and Son of Man. HE speaks still, through His members on arth, offering to God the worship of earth through the worship of His riestly Body. To learn to use the Psalms so is to grow in the experience f being the Church, the blessed company of all faithful people, the mystical body of Christ.

(4) I do not know whether it is this use of the word "mystical" which as led to the use of the phrase—the "mystical" interpretation of the salms. We have considered briefly the literal, individual, corporate ses of the Psalter. I want to treat rather more fully the method of interpretation which the corporate Christian use of the Psalms ecessarily, as I think, involves. It is not enough—indeed it is not *rporate* worship at all—to picture a congregation of separate individuals reciting a given psalm as the identical expression of their own individual mood. At Divine Service the congregation is primary, the individual econdary. In any case, it will be exceptional (if not unique) to find any congregation of individuals experiencing at the same moment precisely he same mood expressed by the particular authorized Psalm. Corporate worship implies the reverse process—the individual members *entering nto* the "mood" of the Psalm, expressing themselves not as themselves nits but as parts of the larger Unit, cells in the Body, "members" of Christ. *Now* they are speaking not for themselves, but *for* the Church, *s* the Church; *for*, as the mouthpiece *of*, Christ. The words they utter ake now a new meaning. It is "the new song" of the Church, "the Lord's song" of the Lord's people. Or rather, not so much "new," any more than the Christian Church was a new thing. *It is the fulfilment, the ompletion, of the old.* The old words are found to have a deeper, fuller, ompleter meaning than their singers under the Old Covenant knew, or could know. This was the earliest experience of the earliest users of he Psalms in a Christian sense, those who had been led by the CHRIST Himself to see in all the Scriptures—"in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms"—the things concerning Himself (Luke xiv, 27, 44.) Peter's first utterance after the gift of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost pointed to at least three Psalms to proclaim that it was of Jesus of Nazareth, declared by God to be both Lord and Christ, that the writers had spoken. "David speaketh *concerning him* . . . Thou wilt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption" (Acts ii, 25, 27)

—Psalm xvi. "David being a prophet saw beforehand that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh God would raise up *the Christ* to sit on his throne" (v. 30)—Psalm cxxxii. "David saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand until I make thy foes thy footstool" (vv. 34, 35)—Psalm cx. And the first corporate prayer of the Christian community that is quoted (Acts iv, 24-7) uses the second psalm and takes for granted the identity of "thy holy Child Jesus whom thou hast anointed" with "*the* Christ" (the anointed) of the Psalm, against whom "the kings of the earth stood up and the rulers were gathered together."

From the earliest Christian days, then, this was the understood, the assumed, interpretation of the Psalter of the Old Covenant as used on Christian lips. The followers of the New way found in Christ the fulfilment, the completion, of the Old, the *full* meaning proclaimed. Take some of the characteristic words or phrases of the Psalter. "O that the salvation were given unto Israel out of Sion: O that the Lord would deliver his people out of captivity!" (Psalm liii, 7)—there is a typical cry of the old people of God, the Jews in exile. But *salvation*, or deliverance, meant to them a material, national salvation—a deliverance from material enemies, or from a literal captivity among foreigners. Christians had learned the fuller meaning of salvation in Jesus, who should save His people from their sins, in the Christ who had come to deliver them from the bondage of evil. What had been material, this-worldly, had become something bigger and deeper and truer—spiritual, of the eternal world. That is why this interpretation of the Psalms is called sometimes—I think more happily than "mystical"—the "*spiritual*" interpretation. Look at some of the other key words. "*Redemption*"—"He sent redemption unto his people" (cxi, 9), "Let them give thanks whom the Lord hath redeemed" (cvii, 2). To His people of the Old Covenant it meant the redemption from Egypt and the later redemption from Babylon. To Christians, the redemption from all iniquity (Titus ii, 14), the translation from the power and slavery of Satan into the kingdom of the Son of His love (Col. i, 13). For, again, "*the people of God*," "my people," are no longer the Jews but the Church Catholic, membership in which comes not by birth and circumcision, but by faith and baptism; a people gathered out of all nations, the new race, "who in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God" (1 Pet. ii, 10). "*The city of God* " is no longer the earthly Jerusalem, of whom "very excellent things are spoken" (lxxxvii, 2), whom "God upholdeth for ever" (xlviii, 7), but the "Jerusalem which is above, who is free, and the mother of us all" (Gal. iv, 26)—the Church of earth and heaven, the true home of the soul, a spiritual community transcending alike nationality and death, finding its completeness in the ultimate fellowship of the Life Eternal. (Here, as often, the Christian hymns based on the Psalms have caught and expressed in other words the permanent and abiding meaning:—

> Glorious things of thee are spoken,
> Zion, city of our God. . . .
>
> Jerusalem on high, My song and city is. . . .

The King and *Kingdom* of the Old Testament Psalms meant originally the earthly king, a David or Solomon or Hezekiah; later, even in the Psalter, such references pass into the Messianic king and His kingdom, as in the noble picture of Psalm lxxii and of the other "missionary Psalms"—to find fulfilment in *the* MESSIAH—the CHRIST. Nor, as we have seen, is the crucial word CHRIST absent from the Psalms, though it is obscured in our version (as it is not in the Latin) by the equivalent "the Anointed." "Against the Lord and against his Christ" we have already noted in the second Psalm. It comes repeatedly in the 89th Psalm: "I have found David my servant: with my holy oil have I anointed him . . . I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth . . . His seed shall I make to endure for ever and his throne as the days of heaven" (vv. 21 *ff.*); "but thou hast abhorred and forsaken thine Anointed" (v. 37); "Thine enemies have blasphemed thee, and slandered the footsteps of thine Anointed" (v. 50); and in the 132nd, equally a Psalm of Christmastide, "For thy servant David's sake, turn not away the presence of thine Anointed" (v. 10); "There shall I make the horn of David to flourish" (v. 18). One could pursue this theme with many such words—*life*, which passes even in the Psalm from the thought of this physical life alone into the hope at least of a fuller life, but meaning to the Christian the life and immortality which Christ brought to light through the Gospel. Or *sacrifice*. Or *holiness*.

Or, for that matter, such phrases and passages as denounce the enemies of God and of His people. "Lo thine enemies make a murmuring, and they that hate thee have lift up their head. They have imagined craftily against thy people . . . let them be confounded and vexed ever more and more: let them be put to shame and perish" (Psalm lxxxiii, 2, 3, 17). Such a statement, such a prayer, is no longer the statement of a material warfare or a prayer for personal revenge. It is the cry of God's people everywhere and always threatened by His foes. Not now "Gebal and Ammon and Amalek," nor indeed primarily human persecutors, dictators, Gestapo agents, for "our wrestling", as St Paul emphatically declares, "is *not* against flesh and blood, but" against the unseen, spiritual, hosts of evil in the supernatural sphere. Faced by them, aware of them, the Church, if true to God, cannot but exclaim, "Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate thee?" (Psalm cxxxix) (is she not pledged to renounce the devil and all his works?) and to cry, "Consume them in thy wrath, consume them that they may perish, and know that it is God that ruleth unto the ends of the world" (Psalm lix, 13). For she is sharing the agony of Christ face to face with the mystery of wickedness, expressing the Holy One's abhorrence of evil, ranging herself afresh upon the side of God even against the sin which has a footing within herself. So used, these Psalms take the Christian worshipper into a far fuller, profounder understanding of the spiritual struggle than any superficial excision of such passages can do—that fuller meaning which the CHRIST came to bring.

For the point is this. In Jesus of Nazareth THE CHRIST had come (*THE* CHRIST—so in numberless passages in the New Testament the Greek has it. One could wish that our translators had noted the

article where it appears, for it gives a different turn to many a passage to realize whether it is "Christ"—almost a name, as in our common use of it—or *the* Christ, a title, the Fulfiller of the Past, who is spoken of. This would be a useful study to make, but we must not pursue it now.) The Christ had come, and "fulfilled" all that was written; completed the sketch; filled out the meaning; lifted, expanded the material, temporal, personal, national, up and out into the spiritual, eternal, corporate, catholic. And the Psalms found a new meaning on the lips of those who had found in Jesus the CHRIST—*a fulfilment*, a *spiritual* meaning.

Henry de Candole.

(*To be concluded*)

The Last Work of Émile Mersch, Theologian of the Mystical Body

The name of Fr Émile Mersch, S.J., has become familiar to theological students since the publication in 1933 of his biblical and historical work *Le Corps Mystique du Christ*. This has established itself as an indispensable storehouse of the materials necessary for the formation of any adequate doctrine of the Church. Its author had himself regarded it as a necessary stage in the completion of his life's work, which he had for long considered to be the production of a full-scale theological study of the Mystical Body of Christ. He was engaged upon the writing of this when the Germans invaded Belgium in 1940. He had by then produced at Louvain several drafts of the whole book and his final revision of the larger part of it.

On May 14, 1940, Mersch had to leave Louvain and took his final draft with him. On the way to Douai he was suspected of being a German spy in priestly disguise and was detained by the military. He managed to place his manuscript, contained in a portfolio and two attaché cases, in the care of two old members of his order who had been travelling with him. Illness and exhaustion forced them to stop at St Pol, where one of them actually died by the roadside before he could be taken to hospital. Forty-eight hours later his body was removed for burial, but only the portfolio was found with him. The attaché cases must have been taken from beside his body on the roadside and have never been traced. The archpriest of St Pol kept the portfolio containing about half the final draft of Mersch's book, and this was sent to Louvain. Some of the author's colleagues published the book in 1944, using the final revision where it had been preserved and replacing the lost portions by the corresponding parts of the earlier drafts that had been left by Mersch at Louvain.

Mersch himself had been killed at Lens on May 24, 1940, Corpus Christi Day. Very fittingly he said what was to be his last mass on that day and then went to the help of some dying soldiers who were lying on the banks of the canal near at hand. The aerial bombardment was very heavy that day and was the probable cause of his death. His body rests in the cemetery at Lens.

The tragic events of 1940 have left their mark on *La Théologie du Corps Mystique*, which is the title under which his colleagues published Mersch's last work. The editing of the various drafts must have been a laborious task, but the result amply repays a true labour of love. The editors are able to claim with truth that "if the book as a whole has not reached the perfection which Mersch would have striven to give it by another year's work it remains none the less a faithful expression of his thought and the true realization of the work of a life-time."

It is safe to say that these two volumes are worthy to be placed alongside the earlier two that made Mersch's name well known. The four volumes together provide the most exhaustive and valuable treatment to date of the subject of the Mystical Body of Christ. The importance of this for theology is easy to see. As E. L. Mascall has recently written, "After the phase of individualism through which, in the Middle Ages to some extent but far more in the post-Reformation period, Christian thought and piety have passed, theology is beginning at the present day to recover its sense of the corporate nature of both sin and redemption. The credit for this must very largely be given to the three French writers, Mersch, Congar and de Lubac" (*Christ, the Christian and the Church*, p. 142). *La Théologie du Corps Mystique* will certainly do much to help the further development of theology along these lines.

It is interesting to see that the first 156 pages are given to what is called "Introduction Théologique et Philosophique" and that Mersch has much to say about a question that Mascall himself regards as an important one for the present day. "What is Theology about?" would seem to be a point that theology cannot well avoid, yet Mascall points out that books on the study of theology have been published that entirely fail to deal with it. For Mersch the whole form of his book is fixed by the answer that he gives in his "Introduction." He passes in review the answers of the scholastics: "Some say that the subject of theology is God in so far as He is the Revealer, or divine truth in so far as it is capable of being revealed; others that it is God as He can be known through Holy Scripture; others, that it is God as infinite Being; still others that it is God as Saviour and Source of all or God the great 'I am' " (i, 58). For himself he is quite ready to follow Aquinas and all the schoolmen in stating that God is the final object of theology, but, God being incomprehensible to human reason, he would state the material, immediate object of theology as "the Whole Christ: God in so far as He makes Himself ours and wholly ours" (*ibid.*, 59). Here we have an explicit statement of the Mystical Body of Christ as the integrating factor of all theology; a conviction that is implicit in so much recent theological work. The rest of this book may be regarded as a justification of this statement of the material object of theology by a process of demonstration. Mersch chooses the main doctrines of the faith and shows that their meaning and essential unity can be shown if they are seen in their true setting of "the Whole Christ." It will be worth while studying carefully the content that he gives to the all-important terms "le Christ total" (the Whole Christ) and "Christ mystique" or "Corps mystique":

"The Whole Christ is Christ considered with all that is inseparable from Him in reality: with the Trinity, within which He makes but one God; with all humanity, of which He makes one body, His own. This is the 'Totus et integer Christus' of whom the documents of the faith speak. He has in Himself the fulness of divinity and He is the fulness of humanity in whom all men make but one, εἷς, and who is 'unus de Trinitate.' This Christ is exactly the same as the historical Christ, the Jesus of the Holy Virgin and of the Eucharist; there is but one Christ. But, as He Himself said during His mortal life, He is the Vine and we are the branches within the Vine. He dwells in us and we in Him so really, so intensely, that living in Him as He Himself lives of the Father, we are one in Him as He is one with the Father" (i, 60).

If we have this definition in mind we can see why Mersch sees his subject in this book as a synthesis of theology and not as one subject among many others in theology. He believes that he is here dealing with "the central truth, the truth that makes everything unified and intelligible for us. This truth must be a truth that speaks at the same time of God and of God's works, expressing the unity between God Himself and the whole of humanity. This truth is precisely the truth of the Whole Christ, of Christ, God and Man, head and body, yet one. Therefore the truth of the Whole Christ must be the unity in the science of supernatural truths" (*ibid.*, 63).

The demonstration of this conviction moves through the four remaining books into which the work is divided: The Coming of Christ; The Christ; The Trinity; In the Christ. Three main doctrines are grouped under the first of these headings: Creation; Original Sin; Mary, the Chosen Mother of the Christ. It is interesting to see Mersch's treatment of the Thomist-Scotist controversy over the nature of the connexion between the Fall and the Incarnation (i, 165-70). The meaning of Creation can be seen only through the Incarnation, for "God shows His love, the Creation is the beginning of a total giving: if (in Creation) He gives to men all their being, it is in order to give them all His (in Incarnation)." Original sin is seen to be essentially corporate and divisive in its effects, and the answer must be the supernatural organic unity of the New Man. The place of the Blessed Virgin Mary is one of special honour since in her, by divine fiat and human response, the unity of God and man was once for all accomplished. She has also an equally special and continuing connexion with the Whole Christ. "As the life of Christ is prolonged here below, so the rôle of the Mother of Christ is also extended. The Whole Christ is Christ and Christians. To be mother of Christ in fulness Mary must be mother of Christians themselves also" (i, 227). "Ecce ancilla Domini, et Filii et filiorum Domini."

It is noteworthy that Mersch treats the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Atonement in the closest possible connexion, thereby avoiding the errors that come from a concentration on one "moment" in the life of the Incarnate Lord at the expense of others. His book III, "The Christ", shows the value of his unitive treatment perhaps more clearly than any other part of his work. As far as the Atonement is concerned he claims to be following closely in the steps of St Thomas:

"In St Thomas the theology of redemption and of vicarious satisfaction tends to be considered in close connexion with the doctrine of the mystical body. But, except for the great Thomists of the thirteenth century, his school has hardly followed him in this. They have been more occupied with completing the details of the theory of St Anselm . . . than in seeking, with St Thomas, to see how the redemption had been a work of unity, intrinsically efficacious, with an intrinsically universal bearing over against a sin of solidarity" (i, 301).

The second volume (containing books IV and V) opens with a treatment of the Holy Trinity, the connexion having been touched upon earlier, in volume i: "The mystical body will be the reflection and a sign of the trinitarian unity. In seeing the unity of Christians men will see, by faith, the unity of the divine persons" (i, 285 *f.*). We meet at once Mersch's famous phrase "Filii in Filio" and he shows the relationship of the "sons" to the Persons of the Holy Trinity. "United to Him, who is the Son, we are, in Him and through Him, sons by adoption of the First Person; members of the Word, the Second person; associates in that work of love which has its end and summit in the Holy Spirit, the Third Person" (ii, 15). He expounds St Augustine on our status as "membra unigeniti Filii Dei" and adds to the store of rich historical material already provided in his earlier book.

Within the section on the Trinity we are given treatments of the revelation of God and of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Here again we notice an illuminating passage on a long-standing theological crux: the "filioque" clause. What will our Orthodox brethren say of this statement, which must, however, be judged within its context: "Perhaps it is legitimate to remark that the Churches in which the doctrine of the procession 'ab utroque' is denied or relegated to the shadows are also those where the Christian life appears less active, less fervent, less given to evangelism and to missionary activity, less careful to guard full liberty of action and to avoid all cæsaro-papism"? (ii, 151). Mersch is not happy with the expression sometimes found, that the Holy Spirit is the soul of the Body of Christ. He prefers to lay stress on the Spirit as the source of its life and growth. There is here a point of contact with the missionary theology of Père Charles, also of Louvain, who sees in the growth of the Body of Christ the true nature of missionary work (see his *Dossiers de l'Action Missionaire*, p. 34. Brussels, L'Édition Universelle, 1938). Mersch also here lays the foundation for the structure of moral theology that he has dealt with in his earlier book entitled *Morale et Corps Mystique*. The Body is active by the Holy Spirit, and thus the very nature of all its activity is Divine Love.

The last section has been named by the editors "In the Christ" and gives a treatment of the concept of the supernatural followed by three long and important chapters on the Church and Sacraments and the two concluding (rather incomplete) chapters on Grace. Only the chapter on the Sacraments was preserved in the final draft: the others show obvious signs of lacking the coherence and polish that Mersch would have given them. On the doctrine of the Church we notice the clear distinction made between the terms "Church" and "Mystical Body."

"The term 'mystical body' signifies, in the ordinary language of the Church, the 'ensemble' of those who live in the life of Christ, which is a life of various degrees. The word 'Church' represents the society of the baptized faithful under the legitimate pastors. The two realities are assuredly extremely akin . . . but, on this earth, they are not perfectly unified. It is possible to be a member of the Church, the visible society, without actually living with the life of Christ. Such would be a Catholic obstinately in sin. Also it is possible to live truly with the life of Christ without being effectively joined to the visible society which is the Church. Such would be the case of a pagan who had received charity and grace without even knowledge of the Church, or of a fervent catechumen" (ii, 196). Mersch goes on to make the valuable point that the theology of the mystical body may provide the best hope for the *rapprochement* of Christians to-day. "The concept of the mystical body has the advantage, very great in some cases, of being but little charged with specially Latin or juridical terms and of having kept almost the same sense for many of our separated brethren as for us. In keeping clear its special sense one keeps open the way for exchanges of views and, who knows? for formulæ of union. It cannot be without reason that Providence has preserved it through the centuries, and in our own day placed it once again in such a position of prominence in Christian thought" (ii, 197).

Émile Mersch has therefore left us not merely a great treatment of an important theological theme but a work the careful study of which by Christians of divided Christendom may bring nearer to fulfilment the prayer of the One Lord of us all: "ut omnes unum sint."

The editors, to whom every reader of this book owes so much, would put us further in their debt if they provided future editions with indexes comparable to those found in *Le Corps Mystique du Christ.*

Bibliographical Note

1. *Le Corps Mystique du Christ.* 2 volumes, 3rd ed., Brussels (L'Edition Universelle), 1946.
2. *Morale et Corps Mystique.* 2nd ed. Same publishers, 1941.
3. *La Théologie du Corps Mystique.* 1st ed. Same publishers, 2 volumes, 1944.

A full bibliography, including Mersch's numerous essays and reviews in various periodicals, will be found on pp. xxxi-xxxiii of Vol. i of *La Théologie du Corps Mystique.*

Norman J. Blow.

Why You Should Read It—VII

JEREMY TAYLOR'S "DUCTOR DUBITANTIUM"

Sir,

You have put me in your debt—though once I thought otherwise. When I agreed to your proposal, more months ago than I like to remember, that I should write about *Ductor Dubitantium*, I had often used the book, but never (I confess it to my shame) read it through. Now the undertaking could no longer be deferred; and the prospect frightened me. A treatise of eight hundred and nineteen pages in the folio edition of 1696, or six hundred and eighty, printed small, in the quarto of 1880, was not one to take in hand unadvisedly, lightly, or

wantonly; it called for stern resolve and the grace of perseverance; it could scarcely be despatched but with prayer and fasting. Add to which that, if I had not read this particular work, I had read enough in Taylor to know, and fear, his exuberant prolixity, his long digressions, his innumerable uncalled-for citations of authors Christian and pagan. "The sermons of Protestant divines of the seventeenth century," wrote Newman with some justice, "how often are they mere repertories of miscellaneous and officious learning! Take those of Jeremy Taylor, for instance, and what an array of quotations, anecdotes, similes, and good sayings, strung upon how weak a thread of thought." When I pondered these things, I thought none too kindly of you, Sir, and meanly of my own acquiescence.

Nor were my forebodings belied when I began to read. You would think it were no great matter to show that it belongs to conscience to accuse and excuse. Yet Taylor dares not leave the demonstration without quoting St Paul, Hierocles, Isocrates, Apuleius, Lucretius, Epicurus, Plautus, Seneca, Juvenal, Laertius, and Persius—all in the space of a page. In the next chapter, off he goes into an eleven-page discussion of the relation of reason to faith that, interesting and illuminating as it is, is hardly needed in a work of moral theology. And so I was soon weary, and thinking that this was indeed a "mere repertory of miscellaneous and officious learning," fine for dipping into, but sickening to peruse.

But then, as I read on, my mood changed entirely, and my weariness gave way to growing admiration. I think it was towards the end of the second chapter that my eyes were opened. There, in treating of the question whether a judge may use in court knowledge he has come by privately, Taylor tries a fall with the great Aquinas and comes off best, as it seems to me. After that I found evidence steadily accumulating that he was not only a first-rate casuist, but capable of taking his readers deeper into principles than any other author I had read. No doubt, Sir, you have had recourse, on occasion, to the works of Roman Catholic moralists, and been exasperated, as I have, by the often unconvincing conventionality of their "proofs" and their substituting appeals to Trent, popes, and the Holy Office for the more satisfying processes of reason. All but a few of them seem to have inherited something of the penny-in-the-slot manner of the *summa casuum*. But there is nothing of this in Taylor. He quotes authorities, indeed—sometimes too many of them for his readers' comfort—but never as a substitute for examining the intrinsic probability of an opinion. We may not always agree with his conclusions; but we cannot complain that the paths by which he reaches them are anything but plain and open to scrutiny. It was no empty boast when he wrote in his preface, "I have begun an institution of moral theology, and established it upon such principles and instruments of probation which every man allows, and better than which we have none imparted to us." And so, Sir, as I have said, I am indebted to you for the incentive to read at last what I should have done well to read long since.

But I must give my account of the book. The story of Taylor's eventful life is told by Reginald Heber—later Bishop of Calcutta—in the first

volume of his edition of *The Whole Works*, published in 1822; and I need not repeat what can be seen there, except to indicate the circumstances in which *Ductor Dubitantium* was written. It was its author's favourite child; and he worked at it for many a year. No record remains, I think, of when he began it. All we know is that by 1655 he was far enough advanced with it to be "preparing" the first three books of it "to the presse." He was then living in Carmarthenshire, on an estate belonging to his second wife. Thirteen years before, when he was twenty-nine, he had joined the King at Oxford, and for a time followed the royal army as chaplain, his rectory of Uppingham being sequestrated by the Presbyterians. But by 1644 he had retired to Wales. There he supported himself by keeping a school, with the help of William Nicholson, afterwards Bishop of Gloucester, and William Wyat, afterwards prebendary of Lincoln. It must have been in this decade, during which he was imprisoned three times, though not for long or with rigour, that he wrote the bulk of his *magnum opus*. But not until 1658, when he was appointed to a lectureship at Lisburn in Ireland, and went to live at Portmore, did he find the leisure to complete it to his satisfaction. In the spring of 1660 he was in London, superintending its final passage through the press; and happening to come under the notice of the returning King while he was there, he addressed the dedication to him. Later in the same year he was appointed Bishop of Down and Connor (to which in 1661 the adjacent diocese of Dromore was annexed) and vice-chancellor of Dublin University.

The design of *Ductor Dubitantium* is amply declared in the preface. Since the Reformation the theologians of the Church of England had had to put all the time and energy they could spare from their cures into the work of apologetic, so that moral theology was neglected. Consequently, says Taylor, "for any public provisions of casuistical theology, we were almost wholly unprovided; and like the children of Israel in the days of Saul and Jonathan, we were forced to go down to the forges of the Philistines to sharpen every man his share and his coulter, his axe and his mattock. We had swords and spears of our own, enough for defence, and more than enough for disputation; but in this more necessary part of the conduct of consciences, we did receive our answers from abroad, till we found our old needs were sometimes very ill supplied, and new necessities did every day arise." There were in the Roman books "very many excellent things exposed to view," but there were pernicious things too. There was laxism, making sin to appear no sin. There were worthless arguments founded on fantastic analogies. Above all—this is the principal substance of the indictment—there was abuse of extrinsic probability. The Roman casuists would string together *catenae* of contradictory authorities, and then conclude, not that the authorities were evidently fallible, and therefore the intrinsic probability of their judgments must be examined, but that both opinions were probable, and the conscience at liberty. *Alii aiunt, alii negant; utrumque probabile.* "By this means," Taylor drily remarks, "they entertain all interests, and comply with all persuasions, and send none away unsatisfied." He himself seems to have been a probabiliorist; but his shafts are aimed not so much at probabilism as at the misuse of it.

Taylor saw a need, therefore, "to unwind the entanglements of art, nd to strip moral theology of all its visors"; and this he set himself to o, knowing it to be "a great work and too heavy for one man's ioulders," but conscious that someone must begin. He describes the lan he adopted in the introduction to his fourth book:

> He that intends to consider any thing fully and entirely, must consider it a all four kinds of causes. The formal cause or the essentiality of good and vil, is the doing it with or against conscience . . . and this I have explicated) the first book. The material cause of good and evil is derived from the object r the rule, which is the laws of God and man . . . and this I have largely presented in the second and third books . . . To make up the rule of conscience mplete, it is necessary that it be considered, by what rules and measures a od action may be rightly conducted . . . which will be done by considering ne efficient and the final causes of all human actions.

His first book thus corresponds to the *Tractatus de conscientia* of the text-ooks, treating first of the nature of conscience, and then of its various tates, as it may be right, erroneous, probable, doubtful, or scrupulous. he second and third books make up the *Tractatus de legibus*, the former cing about the law of nature and the scriptural law, the latter about uman law, civil, ecclesiastical, and domestic. The last book, the *Tractatus de actibus humanis*, is concerned with the act of the will, and vith ends.

The originality of Taylor, therefore, does not reside in the lay-out f his work; for that conforms to the pattern that was introduced, it eems, during the post-tridentine revival, and was later followed by St Alphonsus de Liguori in the opening books of his *Theologia Moralis*. It s to be seen rather in his individual treatment of these conventional livisions of the matter. Under the four heads he assembles all the principles and rules needed for the solution of moral questions, not to mention numerous cases, in which he shows how the principles apply. ndeed, I think it is not too much to say that anyone who thoroughly mastered *Ductor Dubitantium* would *ipso facto* become proficient in moral heology and certainly more competent to deal with the problems of o-day than those who have been reared on our modern "Christian thics."

The irony of the situation is that we are scarcely better off now than our fathers were when Taylor wrote his preface. Lacking native equip ment, we are still driven to visit the forges of the Philistines; and thank-ul we are that they are available. Taylor thought to make a beginning merely—to contribute one foundation-stone to the great edifice of English moral theology that he expected would be built. But the house never went up. The climate was become unfavourable, even while he was polishing his work; soon his art was without practitioners; and rom the end of the seventeenth till late in the nineteenth century so more was heard of it. Of late there has again been some clearing of he ground, notably by the present Bishop of Oxford; but we still await he books we need.

The question suggests itself, therefore: Can *Ductor Dubitantium* become he standard text for instruction in the Church to-day? I think not,

unless someone can be found to edit and simplify it. For although Taylor's reasoning is for the most part clear enough, the exuberance of his style, the fecundity of his fancy, and the multiplicity of his illustrations do not make for the plain and undecorated exposition that beginners require. I doubt if anyone yet ungrounded in moral theology and unacquainted with its "terms of art" could read him with much profit. But upon those who have the rudiments of the science he can scarcely fail to have tonic effect. Here is a catholic moral theology that is not oppressed by Roman precedents; here is a smith who can rival the Philistines at their own craft. His devoted work has been too long neglected. For the good of the Church it is high time he came into his own.

Yours, etc.,
G. B. Bentley.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Geoffrey Berwick is Vicar of Crosby Ravensworth, Cumberland, and Dean-designate of St George's Cathedral, Perth, W. Australia.

The Rev. Henry de Candole is Vicar of Henfield and Prebendary of Chichester Cathedral.

The Rev. Norman J. Blow is Vicar of Oxton, Birkenhead.

The Rev. G. B. Bentley is Priest-Vicar of Lincoln Cathedral.

BOOK REVIEWS

An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. By Matthew Black. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 15s.

It is half a century since Arnold Meyer wrote his *Jesu Muttersprache*. Besides the main thesis, that our Lord's mother-tongue was Aramaic, Meyer endeavoured to explain difficulties and obscurities in the language of the Gospels by assuming a faulty Graecizing of some underlying Aramaic word or idiom. Since then we have had weighty contributions by Gustav Dalman, illuminating suggestions from Wellhausen and Nestle, and more daring and imaginative studies in the "Aramaic Gospels" by Torrey and Burney. Few now doubt that, not only was the Palestinian dialect of Aramaic the language spoken by our Lord and His disciples, but that the most primitive strata of the Gospel tradition must also have been in Palestinian Aramaic.

But if it is asked whether the work of the past fifty years marks any advance in our capacity to interpret the Gospels by applying this Aramaic yardstick, it is not unfair to say that any such advance is negligible; in the eyes of the ordinary New Testament student the results so far produced by the handful of "Gospel Aramaizers" have the appearance of philological legerdemain: they attract admiration and applause rather than confidence and conviction. This may be due partly to the ignorance of Aramaic which most New Testament students enjoy, but it is due equally to suspicion of the technique principally used—the detection of alleged mistranslations of hypothetical Aramaic originals. (It may be remembered that it was this same technique

which enabled the late Prof. D. S. Margoliouth to "prove" that the Book of Wisdom was a translation from the Hebrew, and that the Wisdom of Ben Sira had been composed in rhyming Hebrew couplets.)

In view of this mixture of ignorance and scepticism, Dr Matthew Black's study of the subject is timely and helpful. It is a laborious piece of work, but it has the merit of being comprehensible to the reader who possesses little or no knowledge of Aramaic. The method is to lay bare and analyse the elements involved: *e.g.*, What are the characteristics in Aramaic idiom, syntax, grammar, and vocabulary which remain perceptible in a somewhat literal Greek translation? What kind of proof of alleged mistranslation is sufficiently objective to deserve credence? What dependable sources have we for a knowledge of first-century Palestinian Aramaic? Which is the type of text, Neutral or Western, which most faithfully preserves the Aramaic flavour (and is therefore the more primitive)? And do the formal qualities in Semitic poetry throw any light on certain sections of the Gospels?

In the course of this analysis Dr Black exposes weaknesses in the conclusions of Burney and Torrey and even in those of Dalman. But though he justifies prevalent scepticism his results are not wholly negative: he may be over-modest in concluding that his work

> yields one conclusion only which can be regarded as in any degree established, that an Aramaic sayings-source or tradition lies behind the Synoptic Gospels.

Readers will probably be willing to accept more decisively than does the author that

> we have to do with a translation-tradition, sometimes literal, mostly, however, literary and interpretative, but generally bearing the stamp upon it, in one feature or another, of its Aramaic origin.

Cautious to the last, Dr Black will say no more than: "whether that source was written or oral it is not possible to decide."

Even of the Lucan canticles he will say no more than:

> The hymns embodied in the Infancy narrative are thoroughly Semitic, but not necessarily translations, though the observation of word-play when we render them in Aramaic strongly supports the translation hypothesis.

And his summing up on Burney's theory of the Aramaic origin of the Fourth Gospel has surely few equals as a masterpiece of restraint:

> When all other explanations are considered and the evidence weighed, there remains a residue of such evidence where, if the element of conjecture cannot be eliminated altogether, it may nevertheless be said that alternative suggestions are inferior as explanations.

There is, on the other hand, nothing of doubt or restraint in Dr Black's conclusion that the Bezan text

> represents the Aramaic background of the Synoptic tradition more faithfully than do non-Western manuscripts . . . it has a stronger claim than the latter to represent, on the whole, the primitive text of the Gospels.

H. Danby.

Christ Church,
Oxford.

THE CHALLENGE OF NEW TESTAMENT ETHICS. By L. H. Marshall. Macmillan. 15s.

THE WAY OF LIFE. By C. J. Barker. Lutterworth Press. 21s.

Both these books are important. Mr Marshall has written an attractive work without allowing his erudition in German theology to impair a lucid and graceful literary attainment. Add to these qualities vivid illustrations from history, and you have more than enough to ensure an enjoyable passage through 215 pages which expound the ethics of Jesus (their nature; His view of evil, of good; His chief moral imperatives), 134 devoted to St Paul, and a concluding chapter on the ethical approach to Christology.

Mr Marshall's Christology and Soteriology would appear to be Ritschlian. Obviously, as he says, he has not space to expound St Paul's thought completely, yet is it really a faithful account of the apostolic gospel when the Cross occupies a subordinate position and the Resurrection is not mentioned at all? Can St Paul's doctrine of salvation be described without mentioning the κατάκριμα on our race, from which as a first step in our salvation we need deliverance? "In the life and death of Jesus" (p. 245) we are given "a revelation of the love of God for the undeserving" (p. 226)—His work is only a warrant for confidence in approaching God. As in Ritschl, "justification" comes before "reconciliation," and "the essence of Reconciliation is the sense of peace with God" (p. 258). Sin seems to be an individual phenomenon.

As we should therefore expect, the ethical teaching is interpreted on the lines of Harnack and Windisch as certainly practicable. We are to "follow the lead of Jesus," "the unique Master of the Art of Living" (p. 215), "renounce the undivided love of self," and enter the Kingdom of God. The ethics of Jesus are indeed the ethics of the Kingdom of God (p. 31), but the inadequate interpretation that "the kingdom is realized when men voluntarily accept the rule of God" invites the disaster of regarding the kingdom as a realm of moral ends only. Mr Marshall fails to relate the Sermon on the Mount to the New Testament idea of the co-existence of two "ages," and is as embarrassed by eschatology as a Victorian father compelled to mention his trousers in mixed company (the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount are acts of magnanimity which have "no more to do with eschatology than with the man in the moon," p. 194). The more positive outlook of much contemporary theology might simply just not exist. Once, it is true, he quotes Brunner, twice Mr R. V. G. Tasker—out of their context. (He does the same with a quotation from Irenæus.) But it is misleading to describe as Brunner's "dictum" what Brunner himself calls a "truism" needing explication, and which he proceeds to discuss in terms *toto cælo* unlike Mr Marshall's: the kingdom, he says, is "beyond the range of ethical attainment." It is a great pity that Mr Marshall has not given us a thorough and much-needed critique of Brunner and of Reinhold Niebuhr, for he was so clearly the man to do it, as his useful comments on Nietzsche, Julian Huxley, and C. H. Waddington reveal. But nevertheless no student of Christian ethics can afford to miss the book.

I doubt, by the way, whether the first public hospital was founded

a Christian lady in Rome (p. 317). To give but one example, the ospital at Priene was built during the Macedonian period (it was cavated by Wiegand and Schrader), and a patient there would have ood a better chance of recovery, it has been said, than one in Anglo-axon England.

Mr Barker's book is less easy to read but more orthodox in theology. loral philosophy is reducible in the last instance either to sociology nvestigating the content of the moral judgment in various societies ithout making what is investigated the subject of a value-judgment) else to theology, which gives a standard of reference. And without ny theological reference it is impossible to discover any axioms. We e endowed with ethical sensitivity (p. 266), but the content of the loral Law, the Way of Life, has been given us by revelation; "it is arnt from a life that has been lived" (p. 11), and, as we should xpect under a benevolent Creator and Providence, right actions roduce good results, while sin is injurious to society. (I hope that ithfully summarizes Mr Barker's position.)

It is a joy to know that works as learned as this one are still produced country vicarages—even if we do catch Mr Barker taking wistful lances at Methodism. (He would accept John Wesley's "God does mething more with sin than forgive it," and seems to be feeling ntatively after a restatement of the doctrine of perfection such as Dr . E. Sangster suggested not long ago. He is too sanguine in supposing e traditional dispute about justification to be settled (p. 84), as his vn appendix on Niebuhr, written after the rest of his book was mpleted, itself implies.) Mr Barker covers a wide range with mpetence: he attempts to set forth the Christian life in its broad attern as an articulated whole, with a starting-place in repentance nd an end in citizenship of a heavenly country. There are chapters the Art of Life, on Punishment, Work, Fear, and Social Justice: the st section is perhaps that on Love. The author surely makes use of xperience in other professions before ordination; and the result is the nd of assistance to pilgrims in the secular world that has lately been alled for—provided they don't mind some stiff reading.

I hope it will not be thought ungenerous to a good book to offer a ries of small criticisms. In the light of the first chapter of Croce's *olitics and Morals* Christian legislators will accomplish less than Mr arker anticipates. Statements of fact, as on p. 161, "Jewish legislators ad recognized . . .," cry out for references. "Recent philosophy" eans, I suspect, that of "far-off Oxford days" (p. 9) and not that of xford in the last decade. "Since God is love He cannot be wholly lf-sufficient. He needs man" (p. 77) is at best an unhappy sentence. astly, though the book "is not based on the exegesis of New Testament xts" (p. 12), the New Testament scholar will raise his eyebrows to nd "the Kingdom of God" elucidated with the help of Plato, Hart-nann, and Clutton Brock rather than Otto, Manson, and Dodd.

I noticed only one misprint (top of p. 167), but some of the titles of ooks quoted will need correction in the second edition.

Wilfrid Browning.

Hawarden.

The Holy Spirit in the Life of To-day. By F. W. Dillistone. Canterbury Press. 6s.

This book is much easier to read than to review. It is pleasantly written, it is built upon a wide learning, and it contains many interesting quotations. Dr Dillistone first discusses the term "Spirit" and "Holy Spirit," and then gives a survey of the manifestation of the Spirit in the Bible. The main part of the book consists of four chapters on the results of the Spirit's activity, using the terms "life," "power," "order," and "glory" to move in from the use of the words in ordinary life to their specifically Christian content, and he focuses what he has to say in a final chapter entitled "Veni, Sancte Spiritus." His attitude may be gathered from his statement in the book's preface (p. 7) that "it is an essential part of its thesis that Pentecost presupposes Calvary both historically and experientially"—this, of course, is the crucial truth—and from his statement towards the end of the book (p. 106) that "only through relationship or relatedness can the Spirit operate within our own individual lives and within those of the community. The Spirit does not operate *in vacuo*: there must be a true relationship with the *natural* order so that we may experience the *creative* activities of the Spirit; there must be a true relationship with the *saved* order so that we may experience the *redemptive* activities of the Spirit."

The difficulty in expounding the meaning of the Holy Spirit is that while the meaning of the Gospel in the Church for the world is known through the Holy Spirit, the meaning of the Holy Spirit is known not only through the Holy Spirit but also through the meaning of the Gospel in the Church for the world. If this is circular, then it is an essential, not a vicious, circle. Dr Dillistone understands this: the only question is whether he has focused the meaning closely. His theological method is that of *imaginative comparison*, and he has given his reasons for adopting it in his larger work *The Significance of the Cross*. In my judgment this method is both justified and praiseworthy, but it is incomplete. It is no substitute for a systematic clarification of the contents of what is being expounded. It is sheer gain if the artist is added to the philosopher in theological thinking; but the artist is no substitute for the philosopher. In this book the greatest weakness is the absence of a treatment of the relation of the earnest of the Spirit to the eschatological fulness, but it is also misty on the relation of God the Creator to the Holy Spirit and on the meaning of the Holy Spirit for the Church. If the content of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit were clearer, the chapters on the relation of the Holy Spirit to the whole of human life would be clearer. And while we owe Dr Dillistone thanks for relating the Holy Spirit to the life of to-day, the content of this relation must become more concrete and determinative if the Church is to convince the world that it has in a form that is relevant life, power, order, and glory. But many readers may have their minds quickened by reading this book.

H. Cunliffe-Jones.

Bradford.

Prayer Book for 1949. By Oscar Hardman. A suggested revision of the Book of Common Prayer, humbly submitted by its author to the consideration of the Church of England.

Dr Hardman is issuing this book of his in three parts. Two were ıblished in 1946, and the third he promises to shake out of his sleeve uite shortly. Each costs 6s., and can be obtained by writing to the ıthor at "St Augustine, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol." But they are so on sale in the bookshops—*e.g.*, S.P.C.K. and Mowbrays.

In a short preface he reveals his fear of "the disintegration of the hurch of England as a worshipping community" unless action is taken provide her with an authorized revision of the Book of 1661, unable w to contain the flow of her devotion to the Most High within its nks. He thinks the coming quatercentenary of the first English ayer Book provides an excuse and stimulus again to set about a task hich has already much engaged the Church this century. He sends th this child of his, an unofficial revision, to prophesy in the midst us, to energize "general discussion," and "even" to "contribute a ggestion here and there to the official editors." He has attempted o rearrange and revise the contents of the Book of Common Prayer the interests of convenience and intelligibility; to make provision for e somewhat enlarged liturgical needs of the Church in the modern ge, and to satisfy its sense of liturgical fitness; to take honest account the necessity which has arisen for distinguishing between the member- ip of the Church and citizenship of the Realm; and in all this to reserve unchanged the characteristic temper and balance of the nglican Church."

There were many suggestions offered for the revision of the Liturgy the eighteenth century, and those who were "pillars" in the house our God managed that they should come to nothing: *e.g.*, that icketful of whiggery and wisdom "A New Form of Common-Prayer, ith the Offices thereto belonging; To which are prefixed Reasons for e Proposed Alterations: Humbly Addressed to His Grace the Lord chbishop of Canterbury, by a Clergyman of the Church of England," 753. (His Grace was Tho. Herring, though strangely J. Wickham egg in *English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement* 914), p. 55, makes the dedicating clergyman himself also the Arch- ishop, and Dr Dearmer in *The Truth about Fasting* (1928), p. 110, n. 2, llows in the furrow of his ploughing.) The *Dict. of Anon. & Pseud. Eng. iterature* (1928) awakes in one's breast the suspicion that the *Br. Mus. at.* can claim to be first in the field with this error. In our day is not the "pillars" who have blocked all liturgical reform, though I ink they will need more than such a pettiness as a centenary to move em to fresh activity in this matter. If by grave and weighty considera- ons they are convinced of the immediate necessity of a complete new rayer Book, the centenary might provide a pretext under cover of hich they could urge forward its production. But one imagines that eform will not now come in this wholesale way. In July, 1929, the ishops proposed in Convocation that deviations from 1661 covered by 928 alone should be tolerated, and that they would require lay con- urrence in the parishes before tolerating even such deviations. The

Rev. C. E. Douglas's amendment was carried in the Lower House of Canterbury that "the concurrence of Convocation should be obtained to any general regulations issued for the Province, and of the Synod of the diocese to local regulations by individual bishops." Dr Cranage put forward an amendment, that was likewise carried, for the appointment of a Joint Committee of the two houses to consider the situation created by the rejection of the Revised Prayer Book and to report to another session of Convocation. Dr Lang as President on behalf of the bishops within a cloud of sweet words hedged, edged away from a frank acceptance of the true force of these amendments. Liturgical reform needs for its precursor the reform of the historic episcopate. A book such as that bazaar of sense and sanity, *Bishoprick Papers* (1946), by the Lord Herbert Hensley Henson, lately seated at Durham, reveals with a devastating clarity the traditional attitude in these parts of a bishop towards his presbyters. He is as a headmaster among the school prefects, as a farmer inspecting his pigs; bishops and presbyters are as distinct as cheese and chalk in the orders of creation. It is of an unutterable importance that bishops (who exhort parochial pastors to work in unity with church councils) should change their spots and work in close harmony and consultation with those whom they summon to sit with them in the presbytery. The fiats of episcopal dictators have no weight in the hearts of presbyters. Reform of the Lectionary and of the Baptismal Rite is, however, now under way in the Convocations. Maybe it is such piecemeal revision that the times call for: such alternatives to parts of the 1661 book being made available for experimental use as in the Province of South Africa, and after a period of years, chiselled and altered, made the Convocations' official replacement of such parts of 1661. The Crown and the Parliament could express disapproval. They probably would not to such piecemeal reform. If they did, that might be the hour for the Church to ask for freedom from such interference. Such a vista of the future destroys the usefulness of Dr Hardman's work in spurring us to a full and immediate revision of the Prayer Book. But it remains to express appreciation of his painstaking, detailed consideration of the English Rite in the form of a Prayer Book proposed for 1949, though its value I judge to be more in the nature of an appendix to *The Prayer Book of 1928 Reconsidered* (1943), by Dr Lowther Clarke—*i.e.*, a further study in Prayer Book Revision than an actual trumpeting to the battle. I fear it is not many who will judge they have 18s. to expend on this Essay of Proposals, though those whose studies are in this field will do well to browse in it, and some pastors will find things to lift from it into their parochial liturgizings. The author himself is to be thanked for the trouble and expense he has been to in the production of it, and maybe his soul will be satisfied if it proves to be a fount or fresh thrusting forward of various things eventually incorporate in the sanctioned solemn rites of some of the provinces of the Anglican Communion.

R. P. Symonds.

The Bishop's Hostel, Lincoln.

ASTE IN INDIA. By J. H. Hutton. Cambridge University Press. 18s.

This book has arisen from Prof. Hutton's Lectures on Anthropology at Cambridge, and it contains an immense amount of learning in small space. There is a discussion of the background, of the principal atures of the caste system, and of its possible origin, and the author aws both on his own work in India, specially in connexion with the nsus, and on a very full knowledge of the enormous literature on the bject. At the same time it is far from being a dry work of scholarship nd is illuminated by many illustrations and touches of humour.

Caste is an immensely complex phenomenon and Prof. Hutton otes a remark that an analogy would be "a division of the inhabitants England into families of Norman descent, Clerks in Holy Orders, blemen, positivists, ironmongers, vegetarians, communists and otchmen." He is particularly interested in the puzzle of its origin. arly it is to some extent based on race and colour, as is generally pposed; also in part on occupation, and many castes were originally bes. It is further suggested that geography has much to do with it, ce India is accessible to immigration from many directions in the rth, but there is no outlet to the south, with the result that the rious strata of immigrants simply had to find some *modus vivendi*. l this, however, does not explain the most distinctive feature of ste, typified by the Brahman cook. In class systems elsewhere which e partly analogous the upper classes have always been quite prepared employ the lower as their servants. Prof. Hutton suggests that there an element of primitive magic involved here. The *mana* or soul stuff as thought to be conveyed particularly by cooked food, and the *mana* the higher groups must be kept uncontaminated by that of the lower. ereditary crafts were also thought to have magic attached to them, nd thus reinforced the guild aspect of caste.

Whatever is the origin of caste it has had an amazing cohesive power, nd the author questions whether in any other way so many diverse ements could have lived together peacefully for so many centuries. rticularly striking is the way in which certain sects which arose as a otest against the caste system have eventually been themselves sorbed as castes. Though caste is very far from being purely a religious stitution in origin, its religious significance cannot be ignored to-day s some Hindus themselves would suggest. Dr Hutton makes clear its timate practical connexion to-day with the doctrine of *Karma*. The lief that the personal history of the soul is rigidly determined on a rely individual basis by its own acts leads to the ready acceptance of predetermined position in society with a corresponding lack of any cial initiative by the individual. A very interesting point which merges is that, while an individual can never raise himself in the social ale, a caste as a whole can do so, and there are many instances where w castes have slowly won for themselves recognition as respectable. nfortunately this usually involves the giving up of certain kinds of od which may be a valuable element in their diet, and accepting strictions such as prohibition of widow remarriage. This is typical of e price that has been paid by India for the stability given by the aste system. It has inevitably tended to be extremely negative and

restrictive in all its operation, though the author does not perhaps do justice to the extent of the responsibility taken by the higher castes for the lower in the traditional Indian village society at its best. It is interesting to note that on the question now at issue between Mr Gandhi and Dr Ambedkar, whether the depressed classes (or exterior castes as Dr Hutton calls them) are Hindus or not, he concludes definitely that the great majority of them must be called Hindus, the exceptions being the more isolated tribes.

There is much in the book which is of importance to Christian missions. Dr Hutton points out that the caste organization tends to be more vigorous and closely knit in the case of the lower castes. This has proved one of the great difficulties of the mass movement work in N. India, where the leather workers and sweepers have a very strong organization from which converts find it extremely difficult to break free. There is also the solemn warning to be drawn from the many groups which have been reabsorbed as castes into the old system. But the greatest question to be faced is what can be put in place of the caste system as a social organization. There is undoubtedly a very great need of much more study and research in Christian sociology in India and for the working out of the social implications of Christian theology. In contrast with the Hindu attitude mentioned above, the Christian claims social independence and initiative, but recognizes that behind this we are spiritually members one of another, and that salvation is not something for the individual alone.

C. S. Milford.

London.

The Consecration of Genius. By Robert Sencourt. Hollis and Carter. 21s.

The Christian creative artist knows that his artistic creations stand in the same relationship to him as he does himself to God—that, if we are children of God, then the characters that he creates are children of himself and, so to speak, grandchildren of God. This gives him a special responsibility that is unlike that of any non-Christian artist. For God, who is in him, must also be in them. It is one of the almost staggeringly obvious ways in which the Christian artist, and Christian critic of art, must differ from others. He is necessarily "international" in his output and in his outlook; and a Christian criticism of art must be either superior or inferior to other kinds of criticism. It cannot just be the same. Mr Robert Sencourt is a Christian critic; and he is conscious of the fact. It lends a particular colour, a homogeneous pattern, to all that he says; and it enables him to detect a family likeness in all the artistic creations of great Christians through the ages—whether in music, colour, stone, or literature—something that Mr C. S. Lewis once most aptly called the Christian Smell.

The Church in the West has always been a patron of the arts—at least until the Reformation—when a reversion to Hebraism partly obscured (though never by definition) that Hellenistic tradition which had enthroned Beauty with Truth and Goodness as a supreme attribute of the Godhead; and to this day the Roman Church on the Continent

s fostered a "modernism" that would frighten many of their brethren, th separated and otherwise, in these islands. That is what makes the ustrations in Mr Sencourt's book rather disappointing. There is too le comparison, they are all, or nearly all, so "expected," and there is lack of austerity about them that would have done something to lance the gorgeousness for which one loses one's appetite when the al is so constant and so rich.

The letterpress is otherwise. For here we get a great variety of compari- s—apt illustrations but always the Christian thinker at work upon a ritual interpretation of the arts. Perhaps Mr Sencourt could have en more subtle in his treatment of music. For Catholic composers like d, Palestrina, and Vittoria exude a different kind of devotion from restants of the same school—such as Tallis, Tye, and Weelkes, though family likeness remains. Far be it from a reviewer to suggest that a k should include religion or argue a thesis that the author did not nd; but comparisons of this kind would have broadened the theme thout doing violence to the argument.

t may be that Mr Sencourt is more at home in the world of literature n in that of music. For here we get a much bolder and more exciting atment of the theme. It is here, more than anywhere, that we see true pattern of Christian art emerging and feel that all convention- ties are shed away. The author has both read and travelled widely; d the amount he has digested from these exercises of mind and body here distilled for us in charming and sometimes colourful prose. The our of splendour is native to him; but he writes without pomposity. treatment of the haunting theme of guilt in literature and Man's ure to resolve it on his own level from Sophocles, through kespeare and Dostoievski to Eliot (*The Family Reunion*) would have n welcome; but Mr Sencourt deals sparsely with Greek tragedy and ssian epic fiction not at all, despite their Christian significance, and haps is more concerned with what might be called extroverted, n with introverted, art. His real achievement here is to have made ingle pattern of such an enormous panorama; and one feels, after ouring it, that one has drunk deep of spiritual things.

†Ashley Sampson.

Anatomy of Christian Joy. By E. W. Williamson. S.P.C.K. 1s.

This little book comprises three sermons preached by the Bishop of ansea and Brecon before the University of Oxford in 1944 and 1945. aring in mind the events that were in progress at the time, the oice of the subject was a courageous one. They are discourses of a d to which Church circles, even learned Church circles, are un- ustomed, abounding as they do in classical references, the source of h one being conscientiously recorded in a footnote. These references a miscellany: mention is made of Dr Johnson, Aristotle, the Roman ics, the Church Fathers, Plato, Cicero, St Francis, A. C. Bradley, scal—to name only a few; but, all told, they far outnumber the iptural references, which also are many. No doubt the novelty of s style of discourse would arrest the attention of instructed youth,

if only by awakening in them a salutary sense of how very much they have yet to learn.

The first sermon would appear to be designed as a clearing of the ground, a demonstration of what Christian joy is *not*; though some might feel that Seneca and Epictetus have been dismissed a trifle summarily. The second sermon deals mainly with the conception of joy entertained by the Church of the Middle Ages, concerning which, as the Bishop truly says, "it is difficult to generalize." Nature-mysticism had been officially expelled; "things seen" were not to be enjoyed in and for themselves; they were useful as allegories, *symbols* of some divine truth—no more than that. But "Nature-mysticism has a way of re-asserting itself, and it did so with the coming of St Francis of Assisi, for whom the whole natural world was the direct *expression* of divine reality. Thereafter, classical thought and feeling became the ally of divine revelation." (In the somewhat brief reference to St Francis we miss any allusion to the famous dialogue—or rather monologue—in which the saint acquaints his friend Brother Leo "where perfect joy is to be found.") It is refreshing to find in this sermon extracts from Traherne and Wordsworth set side by side; since the first, a Catholic priest though a mystic, is generally reckoned on the former count as sound in the faith; and the second, a layman and a pantheist, generally not. The Bishop connects them together as "the two greatest English exponents of imaginative cosmology." But what, we may discreetly inquire, what about Blake?

The third of these discourses is by no means easy reading, and must have been difficult to follow if delivered as written. Here some very profound ideas are suggested rather than elucidated: one could wish to see this whole theme developed in the form of a book. Its subject is "Christian Joy in Worship." It takes us beyond cheerfulness and also beyond tragedy—to what are the fruits of the Spirit. It is a veritable Sursum Corda, and we are reminded of the collect for the fourth Sunday after Easter. To attempt an exposition would be impertinent, and indeed impossible in a brief review. One can but say that those who were privileged to hear these sermons—and especially the last—would be well advised to read and ponder their message in this book.

George Seaver.

Kilkenny.

The Secret of St Martin. By Henri Ghéon. Translated by F. J. Sheed. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

Henri Ghéon in his foreword refers in simple and moving terms to an incident on November 11, 1918, when he heard the bells of Savoy ring because it was "the day of St Martin of Tours, patron of Gaul." Ghéon, quite plainly saying that "the fact is that we do not know St Martin," has written eight very forcible chapters on his life, based not only upon Sulpicius Severus, Lecoy de la Marche, Paul Monceaux, and Pierre Ladoué, but also upon his own remarkable intuition and vision of what St Martin of Tours means for France and for the Church Catholic. He links the saint of Tours with Charles de Foucauld—a sure

uch. Martin, a young legionary, born in Pannonia in 316-7, became catechumen at about his tenth year. He had to undergo military rvice, and, like de Foucauld, "the uniform of the monk must wait." was as a young circuitor or lancer that the celebrated episode of the aring of his cloak took place whilst he was in garrison at Amiens. He d not as yet been into battle; but now, in 341, and newly baptized, resolved to exchange Cæsar's service for God's. Cæsar, son of nstantine, threw him into prison to make sure that Martin should in the front battle line on the morrow. But Martin prayed all night; the morning Cæsar's enemies supplicated peace; this was ascribed as miracle to Martin, and he was allowed to leave the army and fulfil s final vocation. Befriended by St Hilary of Poitiers, his "apprentice-ip as an apostle" thrived, and he collaborated with Hilary in the uggle against Arianism. His life fulfilled the earlier, most honourable nception of the monastic estate, labour of the hands and labour of e head. It was at Ligugé, some five miles from Poitiers, that Mero-ngian coins were struck in his honour as a worker of great miracles, missioner of great zeal and success. How he became a priest, says héon, is a secret hidden from us. "The drama of his approach to the iesthood is hidden from us." Hilary died in 368, followed soon after St Litorius, Bishop of Tours. Despite his *noli episcopari* he was made shop of Tours, but remained a monk. Presently his earlier dream of unding a community was realized and the world-famous foundation Marmoutiers was the result. But the Bishop, as Father Abbot, saw at for his foundation to live it must not only have contemplatives and minarians, but also be "populous with children." So it had its famous hool, a notable chapter in the history of education. Martin, says our thor, "was an abbot without the name, a bishop without the appings." The glowing pages relating how he clothed a beggar by nclothing himself prior to saying Mass are too long to be quoted and o good to be abbreviated here; as are also the pages relating to his ork in Touraine and at Amboise. No one familiar with the Swiss alois and with St Maurice can fail to be greatly moved by the author's ferences to St Maurice the Theban and the monastery at Agaune. f his great efforts to secure the abolition of slavery, of his extra-rdinary missionary journeys to Maine, to Poitiers, to Vendôme, to hartres, to Trêves, to Burgundy, to the Bordeaux country it must ffice to say that our author writes with the most remarkable vigour, alism, honesty, and vitality, and the translation is so good that the ader forgets that the book was first written in French. Martin died 395, perhaps 402, on November 8, but his feast was fixed for ovember 11. "Two little parallel walls remain of the original tomb, is before them that we kneel to pray to St Martin." Thank you: . Ghéon; thank you, Mr Sheed.

ALBERT A. COCK.

TREGARON.

A History of the Church. III. The Revolt against the Church: Aquinas to Luther. By Philip Hughes. Sheed and Ward. 25s.

An Anglican reviewer may be allowed to suggest as a more accurate title for Fr Hughes's work, *A History of the Papacy*, and, as a subtitle, *The Revolt of the Church.* Prof. Hugh Watt, reviewing the first two volumes in *History*, June, 1936, rebuked the author sternly for equating the Church with a denomination; now, in reviewing the third volume, we beg him again to heed that warning before he publishes his fourth. For if he treats the Reformation as he has treated these centuries of revolt, if he dismisses the Protestant Churches as he has already tried to demolish Martin Luther, his scholarship will receive none of the recognition it deserves, save among the most passive of his own obedience.

The pity of Fr Hughes's book is its inconsistency. Impartiality we do not ask; but we do demand for a man the liberty to follow facts to their conclusions, and this Fr Hughes appears to be denied. The familiar scandals of the medieval and renaissance church are frankly if discreetly, admitted; it were idle now to deny them. What then? On page after page the conclusion clamours for admission that a root cause of all this was the power-corrupted, centralized papal administration, impotent even to curb and control the activities of the church's officers where she really *lives*, in diocese and parish however remote, to say nothing of the building up there of the Body of Christ —impotent, as in the conditions of the world it could be no other even were it not unceasingly embroiled in the lowest of political turmoil, in which the satiating of an avaricious curia played so integral a part. Yet this conclusion Fr Hughes cannot admit; instead, he has to maintain the papal absolutism, as of divine right, at whatever sacrifice to the consistency of his own array of facts. " If the pope was not to be all (*i.e.*, in Christendom; not of course in the Church . . . then the king would be all; the pope must be all, or the Church would be nothing " (p. 104 and *n.*). The Schism " did not affect the unity of faith about the authority of the papacy " (p. 241). The Conciliar Movement and every stirring of a national church towards liberty or reform are treated in the spirit of the second Psalm; we read of " the rebels within, sapping and mining the very basis of papal authority and of the unity which is the Church's life " (p. 316); of " quisling prelates ready to betray the Holy See " (p. 252, *cp.* 331); of " the abuse " of appealing from the pope to a general council (p. 107); of " the baleful myth of the ' liberties ' of the Gallican Church " (p. 247); and of popes demonstrating their supremacy by repudiating their oaths to the councils which permitted their elevation, and by flouting conciliar decrees even while the Lateran Council passes them (p. 480). The papal sovereignty and its defence in defiance of reason and morality is the consecutive, unitive theme of this book; while there remains a Church which teaches such a doctrine in the Name of Christ, there will be found, please God, Protestant Churches to oppose it.

Of Luther, his work and teaching, Fr Hughes produces a distortion e could hardly believe possible. He offered to the Church, we are d, "a version of Christian teaching that would empty it of all ristian significance, making man, not God, the real focus of religious tivity, divorcing morality from piety, and present conduct from the spects of future salvation. Luther as a Christian force was to prove rile . . ." (p. 499). Lutheranism is "the very inversion of ristianity" (p. 526). "Luther . . . abolished the cleric altother"; "Luther's solution is to abolish the Church" (p. 528 *f.*). nong the "practical consequences" of "Luther's theory," this—There is no point in prayer as a petition, and the whole sacramental tem goes—except as a sign or gesture affirming belief in God as viour. . . . The very Church ceases to have any *raison d'être* as ch" (p. 512; *cp.* 529). "The sole constructive unity the Reformam brings is a political idea, a new conception of the State" (p. 522, *n*). nen we read this written of Luther, and wonder what Fr Hughes ll write of Calvin, we tremble—but not for Calvin.

The author's main authorities are the standard French Roman tholic historians, though German and English works are quoted, re on the later period. His making Hus "Wyclif's second self" 312, *cp.* 309) ignores a valuable essay by Prof. Betts in *History*, ptember, 1939. His giving (however reluctantly) to Cardinal squet the last word upon the Black Death ignores the researches of Wood-Legh, Dr Hartridge, and Dr Coulton (p. 184, *n*). There misprints which need correction on pp. 100, 248, and 317, *n.* 3.

Having said this in censure it is but just to say how much good Hughes has woven around his unitive theme. If the parishes are rdly mentioned, if the Orthodox are seldom recognized except en they stand between the Turk and Rome, some saints and thinkers here, and, best of all, sanctity and thought are awarded primacy influence over event and action. England is best represented by ngland and Sir Thomas More; others we miss. Erasmus is but uctantly conceded to the Reforming side. It was right to include Italian renaissance in a history of the Church, though we doubt ether this summary account achieves as much as should be desired. ere are useful pages upon the mendicants, appendices on popes, lates, cardinals, and conclaves, and there are five maps. There is a tain unction spread over the whole study—of the sort an irritated r Gladstone used to gloss in his books with a pencilled *Ma*—beside ich this review seems almost brutal; in plain truth we prefer in our erpreters more awareness of the stern judgment of God.

HAWARDEN. G. R. DUNSTAN.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

GUS AND ROBERTSON: Norman MacLeish, *Ideal Manhood* (2s. 6d.).
CAR BLACKFORD (TRURO): H. A. Lewis, *Christ in Cornwall?* (2nd ed., 1s. 6d.).
ACKFRAIRS: Vincent McNabb, O.P., *An Old Apostle Speaks* (2s. 6d.).
RNS OATES: Ronald A. Knox, *Epistles and Gospels* (10s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: Leonard Hodgson, *Biblical Theology and the Sovereignty of God* (1s. 6d.); David Daube, *Studies in Biblical Law* (21s.).
CANTERBURY PRESS: G. Ian F. Thomson, *The Oxford Pastorate* (7s. 6d.); F. J. Taylor, *The Church of God* (6s.); W. F. P. Chadwick, *The Inner Life* (6s.).
CHERWELL PRESS, OXFORD: F. H. Roach, *This Church Business* (6d.).
JAMES CLARKE: Oswald T. Allis, *Prophecy and the Church* (15s.); Cornelius Van Til, *The New Modernism* (20s.).
CLOISTER PRESS (LOUISVILLE, U.S.A.): W. Norman Pittenger, *A Living Faith for Living Men* (75 cents).
DACRE PRESS: Andrew Blair, C.R., *The Why and Wherefore of the Church* (2s. 6d.); Hugh Gunning, *Spiritual Consequences of the Peace* (1s.); Trevor Jalland, *On Synodical Order* (1s.).
GOLDEN GALLEON PRESS: Maurice Balk, *Ventures in Verse* (n.p.).
HOLLIS AND CARTER: W. P. Witcutt, *Blake. A Psychological Study* (8s. 6d.).
HOLY CROSS PRESS, N.Y.: Felix Cirlot, *Apostolic Succession at the Bar of Modern Scholarship* (50 cents).
HUTCHINSON: F. H. Cleobury, *God, Man and the Absolute* (15s.).
LONGMANS: C. H. Dodd, *The Gospel and the Law of Christ* (1s. 6d.); L. J. Baggott, *Jesu, Joy of Man's Desiring* (6s.).
LUTTERWORTH PRESS: T. H. L. Parker, *The Oracles of God* (12s. 6d.).
MOWBRAY: P. M. Barry, *No Cross—No Victory* (1s. 9d.); P. C. Ingrouille, *Temptation* (1s. 9d.); Father Andrew, *In the Silence* (4s. 6d.); H. N. Bate and F. C. Eeles, *Thoughts on the Shape of the Liturgy* (3s.).
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR CIVIL LIBERTIES: Geoffrey Parsons, *Black Chattels* (1s.).
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Charles Williams, *Judgement at Chelmsford* (2s. 6d.); Michael Polanyi, *Science, Faith and Society* (2s. 6d.); B. K. Rattey (Ed.), *Saint John—School Clarendon Bible* (3s. 6d.).
PHILADELPHIA CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY: James Arthur Muller, *Who Wrote the New Prayers in the Prayer Book?* (50 cents).
PRESS AND PUBLICATIONS BOARD: F. C. Eeles, *Wall Surfaces: Ancient Usage and Modern Care* (9d.).
RELIGIOUS DRAMA SOCIETY: Henzie Raeburn, *Beginning of the Way* (1s. 6d.); H. M. Richards, *The Flight* (1s. 6d.).
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: Evelyn A. Downs, *The Drama of the Spirit* (6d.).
S.C.M. PRESS: E. R. Micklem, *The World's Ransom* (6s.); F. C. Bryan, *Concerning the Way* (6s.); Alec Robertson, *Contrasts—The Arts and Religion* (6s.); A. R. Bielby, *Approach to Christianity* (2s.).
SHEED AND WARD: John Friedman, *The Redemption of Israel* (8s. 6d.); F. J. Sheed, *Theology and Sanity* (12s. 6d.); Albert Béguin, *Léon Bloy: A Study in Impatience* (12s. 6d.); Philip Hughes, *History of the Church, Vol. III* (25s.).
S.P.C.K.: A. T. Macmillan, *Whosoever Will be Saved* (4d.); Douglas O'Hanlon, *Features of the Abyssinian Church* (2s.); C. Kenneth Sansbury, *Japan. The Past and the Future* (6d.); A. T. Welford, *Memorial Services* (2s. 9d.); Michael D. Townroe, *More Abundant Life* (6d.); Jorian Jenks (Ed.), *Encounter* (1s. 3d.); Geoffrey Curtis, C.R., *William of Glasshampton, Friar, Monk and Solitary* (10s. 6d.); K. C. Joyce (Ed.), *The Church of God* (1s.); R. H. Ward, *The Figure on the Cross* (2s.).
S.P.C.K. AND NATIONAL SOCIETY: D. H. Barber, *The Church Army in World War II* (2s.); James G. Laidler, *Voluntary Schools* (4s.).
S.P.C.K. AND THE SWORD OF THE SPIRIT: *The Task of the Churches in Germany* (6d.).
TRAFTON PUBLISHING CO.: Felix Cirlot, *Apostolic Succession and Anglicanism* ($4.00).
TYNDALE PRESS: H. P. V. Nunn, *The Fourth Gospel: an Outline of the Problem and Evidence* (1s. 6d.).
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS (C.U.P.): Henry N. Wieman, *The Source of Human Good* (20s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher